DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 459 635 HE 034 523

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Mazzoli, Andrew Joseph |
| TITLE | Faculty Perceptions of Influences on the Curriculum in Higher Education. |
| PUB DATE | 2000-00-00 |
| NOTE | 153p.; Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Carolina. |
| PUB TYPE | Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC07 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *College Faculty; *Curriculum Development; Educational Trends; Higher Education; *Influences; Institutional Characteristics; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics |

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to study faculty perceptions of the influence of groups outside the faculty on the curriculum in higher education and to determine whether perceptions of influence are contingent on institutional type and selected faculty characteristics. The faculty of two master's degree granting liberal arts colleges and two community colleges were surveyed (n=489) to determine faculty perceptions of the influence of students, college administration, government, the public, employers, licensing agencies, and professional organizations on the curriculum. Descriptive statistics were used to examine trends. Regression was used to determine if age or number of years in higher education was significant. Chi-square was used to determine the contingency of the faculty characteristics and institutional types examined. Influence on content and courses offered were used as indicators for the larger idea of curriculum. A return of 65.6% (n=321) of technically valid responses was adequate for statistical analysis. Overall, faculty answered that they have "heavy" to "total" influence on courses offered and even more influence on course content. Faculty most frequently perceived a "moderate" to "light" amount of influence of outside groups on the curriculum as a level that is "about right." Chi-square analysis of faculty perceptions of the influence of many of the outside groups is contingent on institutional type, academic discipline or field, academic rank, and tenure. Overall, faculty perception of outside influence is independent of race and gender. Regression showed no statistical significance for age or the number of years in higher education. There were differences in the faculty perceptions of outside group influence that are attributable to institutional type and selected faculty characteristics. The idea of faculty autonomy with regard to the curriculum is largely supported. Six appendixes contain the questionnaire and supporting data tables. (Contains 15 tables and 59 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 459 635

# FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF INFLUENCE ON THE CURRICULUM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Andrew Joseph Mazzoli

Bachelor of Science
The State University of New York, Upstate Medical University at Syracuse, 1974

Master of Health Sciences
Medical University of South Carolina, 1981

---

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

College of Education

Department of Educational Leadership and Policies

University of South Carolina

2000

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Mazzoli
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Major Professor
Chair, Examining Committee

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Dean of the Graduate School

HE034583

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the Moms and Dads who would consider traveling this road. Pray first, think long, work hard, take a little time every now and then, and may God bless.

My wish is that you meet the kind of people that I have along the way.

*****

And to the spouses and children they at once bring with them, and leave behind. My loving wife and children know well what I mean.

My wish is that your family grows from this experience as mine has.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

God has been gracious to me in all that has come to pass and blessed me through the people who He placed in my path, and for whom I am thankful.

For Dr. Welsh, who graciously consented to chair my committee, and for Dr. Anderson, Dr. Fidler, and Dr. Samuels who were willing to faithfully see me through, despite the time and distance, I am thankful.

For citizen scholars like Hank Chardos, who have the courage to seek and stand for His Truth, and scholar citizens like Dr. James Sears, who have the conviction to seek and stand for his truth, I am thankful.

For colleagues who understood much of what this work was about and who ministered to me in word and especially by lifting me up in prayer, I am thankful.

For friends and family who understood little of what this work was about but chose to cajole, support, and encourage anyway, I am thankful.

For Peter, Paul, Helen, Christan, and Carson who understood even less of what this work and the sacrifice was about, but loved their Dad anyway, I am thankful.

For my wife Sue who understood completely what this work was all about and never lost faith in me, even when I wondered about myself, I am thankful.

And for His gracious provision and so great a salvation for one such as me, I am forever and unspeakably thankful.

Ephesians 2:8-10

Abstract

Faculty Perceptions of Influence on the Curriculum in Higher Education

Andrew Joseph Mazzoli

PURPOSE: To study faculty perceptions of influence of groups outside the faculty on the curriculum in higher education and determine if perceptions of influence are contingent on institutional type and selected faculty characteristics. METHODOLOGY: The faculty (n = 489) of two masters degree granting, liberal arts colleges and two community colleges were surveyed, using a questionnaire designed by the author, to determine faculty perceptions of the influence of students, college administration, government, the public, employers, licensing agencies, and professional organizations on the curriculum. Descriptive statistics were used to examine trends. Regression was used to determine if age or number of years in higher education were significant. Chi-squared was used to determine contingency of the faculty characteristics and institutional types examined. Influence on content and courses offered were used as indicators for the larger idea of curriculum. RESULTS: A return of 65.6 percent (n = 321) of technically valid responses was adequate for statistical analysis. Overall, faculty answered that they have "heavy" to "total" influence on courses offered and even more influence on course content. Faculty most frequently perceived a "moderate" to "light" amount of influence of outside groups on the curriculum as a level that is "about right". Chi-square analysis of faculty perceptions of the influence of many of the outside groups is contingent on institutional type, academic discipline or field, academic rank, and tenure. Overall, faculty perception of outside influence is independent of race and gender. Regression showed no statistical significance for age or the number of years in higher education. CONCLUSIONS:

Faculty perceive that they have "heavy" to "total" influence on the curriculum. Faculty perceive that a "moderate" amount of influence of outside groups is "about right". More than a "moderate" amount of influence is not. There were differences in the faculty perceptions of outside group influence that are attributable to institutional type and selected faculty characteristics. Despite acknowledged influences and differences, the idea of faculty autonomy over the curriculum is largely intact.

DISSERTATION DIRECTOR: Dr. Michael F. Welsh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

DEDICATION ..... ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... iii

ABSTRACT ..... iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... v

LIST OF TABLES ..... vii

CHAPTER ONE - Nature and Significance of the Study ..... 1
- Introduction ..... 2
- Purpose of the Study ..... 3
- Research Questions ..... 5
- Definitions ..... 6
- Delimitations ..... 8

CHAPTER TWO - Literature Review ..... 9
- A Matter of Perception ..... 9
- European beginnings: Rule by the Learner, the Learned, and the Powers That Be ..... 12
- The American Experience: Government Governing from the Beginning ..... 14
- Liberal Education and the Rise of the Professional and Technical Curricula ..... 19
- The Elective Curriculum and the Beginning of Student Influence ..... 24
- The Rise of the Administration and Faculty Professionalism ..... 26
- Influences from Private and Voluntary Enterprises ..... 29
- More Recent Issues ..... 32

CHAPTER THREE - Methodology ..... 36
- Sample ..... 36
- Description of the Questionnaire ..... 37
- Analysis in Terms of the Data ..... 40

CHAPTER FOUR - Results ..... 40
- General Findings ..... 43
- Research Question 1: Faculty Perception of Their Influence ..... 45
- Research Question 2: Faculty Perception of Outside Group Influence ..... 51
- Research Question 3: Amount of Influence by Level of Influence ..... 54
- Research Question 4: Faculty Perception of Influence by Institutional Type ..... 62
- Research Question 5: Faculty Perception of Influence by Characteristic ..... 65
  - Academic Discipline or Field ..... 65
  - Academic Rank ..... 69
  - Tenure ..... 72
  - Race ..... 75

Gender ..... 78
Age and Years in Higher Education ..... 80
Summary of Results ..... 81

CHAPTER 5 - Discussion ..... 84
Summary ..... 84
Discussion ..... 85
Conclusions ..... 91
Implications for Governance and the Curriculum ..... 93
Recommendations for Further Study ..... 94

REFERENCES ..... 98

APPENDICES ..... 105

Appendix A Questionnaire ..... 106

Appendix B Correlation Coefficient Tables for Amount of Faculty Influence by Level of Influence ..... 110

Appendix C Contingency Tables for Amount of Influence of Outside Groups on Courses Offered by Level of Influence ..... 113

Appendix D Contingency Tables for Amount of Influence of Outside Groups on Course Content by Level of Influence ..... 121

Appendix E Summary Tables for Percent Response for Influence of Outside Groups by Institutional Type ..... 129

Appendix F Summary Tables for Percent Response for Influence of Outside Groups by Faculty Characteristic ..... 132

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Percent response for Faculty Influence on Courses Offered by Institutional Type and Faculty Characteristics ..... 46

Table 2. Percent Response for Faculty Influence on Course Content by Institutional Type and Faculty Characteristics ..... 47

Table 3. Percent Response for Perceived Amount of Faculty Influence on Courses Offered by Academic Rank ..... 49

Table 4. Percent Response for Perceived Amount of Faculty Influence on Course Content by Academic Rank ..... 50

Table 5. Percent Response for Faculty Perception of Amount Outside Group Influence on Courses Offered ..... 52

Table 6. Percent Response for Faculty Perception of Amount of Outside Group Influence on Course Content ..... 53

Table 7. Summary of Chi-square for Faculty Perceptions of the Amount of Outside Group Influence by Level of Influence on Courses Offered ..... 55

Table 8. Summary of Chi-square for Faculty Perceptions of the Amount of Influence of Outside Groups on Course Content by Level of Influence ..... 57

Table 9. Contingency Table for Amount of College Administration Influence on Courses Offered by Level of Influence ..... 59

Table 10. Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Influence on courses Offered and Course Content by Institutional Type ..... 63

Table 11. Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Academic Discipline or Field ..... 66

Table 12. Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Outside Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Academic Rank ..... 70

Table 13. Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Tenure ..... 73

Table 14. Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Race. ..... 76

Table 15. Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Influence on Courses Offered and

Course Content by Gender ..... 79

## Chapter 1

## Nature and Significance of the Study

This chapter provides an introductory overview and discussion of the significance of the study. Specific research questions are formulated and definitions of terms and concepts given. Delimitations of the study are also described.

### Introduction

"Curriculum is the battlefield at the heart of the institution", concluded J.B. Lon Hefferlin after an exhaustive study of educational reform (Rudolph, 1990). So compelling is this metaphor that the Stanford University press published a book entitled "The Battlefield of the Curriculum: Liberal Education and American Experience". Carnochan (1993) points out that his work is limited by his experience as scholar at Harvard and Stanford, just as Yale's Jarislov Pelikan has an idea of the university bounded by examination of the presidencies of Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins, Andrew Dickson White of Cornell, and William Harper Rainey of the University of Chicago. He also points out that the works are limited by the inclusion of only American private universities (Carnochan, 1993). Nonetheless, the issues of conflict over the curriculum and the influences that have molded the curricula in the respective institutions are documented by scores of other works cited throughout the text. As such, his work is couched in this broader context through many citations to works outside his experience in higher education and support the title that there is conflict over the curriculum and the

conflict is as contemporary as it is historical.

The perspective of the author of this work, in comparison to those of Carnochan and Pelikan, is short, limited to public institutions, and in the professional/technical areas of higher education. However, in the two decades of experience in American higher education the author has seen conflict over curriculum remain and faculty autonomy over curriculum slip away, particularly to accrediting and state policy-making agencies. At the same time, colleagues in the liberal arts and sciences are becoming more entrenched in protecting the erosion of the general studies curriculum in an educational environment that is increasingly professionally and technically oriented. Caught in the middle are programs or professional majors that are at once beholden to external constituencies and internally bounded by entrenched liberal arts colleagues. The result is the continuing loss of faculty autonomy and authority over areas of the curriculum and professional competence for which professional/technical faculty are held accountable.

This brings about the larger question of who really does influence the curriculum and to what level do faculty, all faculty, perceive their autonomy in the context of the external policy makers and internal struggles. Is this concern about the loss of faculty autonomy an isolated perception of the author or do other faculty perceive it as well? Could conflict be the result of various perceptions, both inside and outside of academia, of faculty influence over the curriculum in the context of the idea of faculty autonomy? Given the historical development of the curriculum and the faculty role in its development, what is the recent faculty perception of influence on the curriculum in higher education?

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine faculty perception of their influence on curriculum in higher education and their perception of the relative influence of other groups outside the faculty on curriculum in higher education. Faculty perceptions of influence on components of the curriculum, specifically courses and course content, will be used as indicators, and indicators only, of faculty perceptions of influence on the larger idea of curriculum. Examining all of the subtleties that define curriculum in higher education in America is beyond the scope of the survey and this study. Findings from this study coupled with previous research and historical data should enhance policy development with regard to governance over the curriculum. The results of this study will add to the body of knowledge concerning faculty governance in higher education in matters related to the curriculum.

Specifically, this study will reveal faculty perception of its own influence on the curriculum and the perceived influence of others. Given a better understanding of these perceptions, policymakers in higher education will be better able to address issues of faculty governance in curriculum. The result can be less conflict, less time and energy spent on the defense of academic "turf," and more attention paid to pedagogical matters of the curriculum.

The traditional view of the institution of higher education would place faculty in a position of primary authority over matters pertaining to the curriculum with others outside the faculty having little or no authority. Historically, however, this has never been the case in American higher education and it is not true today (Carnochan, 1993). The influence on curriculum has been, and continues to be, widely distributed. As a

result of this traditional understanding, or misunderstanding, and the current state of affairs, conflict over the curriculum is likely and not uncommon.

To avoid unnecessary conflict over the curriculum, policies and procedures concerning faculty governance may need to be created with the type of institution, characteristics of the faculty, and faculty perceptions of influences on curriculum in mind. Knowledge of faculty perceptions of outside group influence in various settings will enable policy makers to avoid inadvertent transgressions into areas of influence that the faculty perceive belong to them. Simply stated, knowing the borders will avoid turf battles.

There are four different scenarios that are possible in the faculty perception of influences on the curriculum. The first is that faculty perceive that they exercise heavy or total influence on what is taught and that level is right or appropriate. In this scenario a heavy or total amount of faculty influence would be perceived as the right level and little or no faculty influence would be perceived as low or inappropriate. A heavy or total amount of influence from outside groups would be perceived as high or inappropriate and little or no influence of outside groups as the right level. The faculty are likely to object to policies that would reduce their level of influence or increase the level of outside group influence.

The second scenario is that the faculty perceive that they exercise a heavy or total amount of influence on the curriculum and that level is not right or appropriate. The third and opposite scenario is that faculty perceive that they exercise little or no influence on curriculum and that level is the right level. In these scenarios, heavy or total faculty influence would be perceived as high and little or no faculty influence would be

perceived as right. Likewise, heavy or total influence of groups outside of the faculty would be viewed as the right level of influence. Light or no influence by these groups would be viewed as low. In these last two scenarios faculty are not likely to object to policies that reduce their influence on the curriculum or increase the influence of outside groups on the curriculum.

The fourth scenario is that faculty perceive that they exercise little or no influence on the curriculum and that level is not appropriate. Heavy or total influence of outside groups would be perceived as high and little or no faculty influence would be perceived as "low". The faculty are likely to object to policies that further reduce their level of influence on curriculum or policies that increase the level influence of outside groups.

The existence of the first scenario is somewhat idealized and is not consistent with the historical development of higher education in the United States described in the literature. Conflict in this scenario is likely when this idealized faculty perception of their own "total" or "heavy" influence is significantly different from existing faculty governance. Faculty autonomy over curriculum would be compromised. The second and third scenarios are not likely to result in conflict, but are not consistent with the idea of faculty autonomy and the need in centuries past to form the universities that would isolate the faculty pursuit of knowledge from outside interference. The fourth scenario has historically resulted in conflict and is likely to continue to if policy development related to curriculum is not consistent with faculty perceptions of heavy or total influence on the curriculum as the right level of faculty influence.

## Research Questions

To investigate faculty perceptions of influence on curriculum, the following

research questions were addressed:

1. How much influence do faculty perceive that they have on the curriculum in higher education?

2. How much influence, if any, do faculty perceive that groups outside of the faculty have on the curriculum in higher education?

3. Is the faculty perception of the level of influence of outside groups independent of how much influence outside groups have on the curriculum in higher education?

4. Is faculty perception of the influence of outside groups on the curriculum in higher education independent of institutional type?

5. Is faculty perception of the influence of outside groups on the curriculum in higher education independent of selected faculty characteristics?

## Definitions

For the purposes of this study, definitions of key terms used throughout this work are provided to allow for discussion of findings. Curriculum is the formal structural arrangements and substance of what is being taught (Toombs & Tierney, 1995). A course is the basic building block of a curriculum and fundamental unit of professional practice for academics. It can be broken down into modules or units. A course is typically assigned a number and is listed in a schedule of classes. Course content is the information, ideas, attitudes, and skills that make up a course (Toombs & Tierney, 1995).

Faculty are those individuals whose primary roles are teaching, research and service. They hold an academic appointment at their respective institutions. Liberal arts faculty are those individuals who teach courses in areas traditionally understood to be the

liberal arts (e.g. mathematics, science, languages, fine arts, etc.). Professional/technical faculty are those individuals faculty who teach in disciplines that are intended to prepare students for work in a particular vocation, profession, or specialization (e.g. business, computer science, education, health, law).

Autonomy, in the context of this work, is what Altbach (1987) defines as professional autonomy, rather than college substantive or procedural autonomy. Specifically it is "the extent to which the control over immediate working conditions of the faculty member (whether or not some of the conditions also pertain to academic freedom issues) has been decentralized to the working professional level" (p. 9). Academic freedom, "the freedom of the scholar in his/her teaching and research to pursue a scholarly interest in wherever it seems to lead and without fear of termination of employment for having offended some political, religious, or social orthodoxy" (p. 9), is a closely related, but distinct, concept and is treated as such here.

The Carnegie Classification is the method developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching used to sort colleges and universities in the United States into similar groups. Typology is often substituted for classification (Carnegie Commission, 1993). Associate of Arts colleges are institutions that offer associate of arts certificate or degree programs and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees. Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I are institutions which offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the masters degree. They award 40 or more master's degrees annually in three or more disciplines. Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges II are institutions which offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate

education through the masters degree. They award 20 or more master's degrees annually in three or more disciplines (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1992).

## Delimitations

In an attempt to broaden faculty representation in the sample, this study focuses on institutions that differ substantially in origin, affiliation, sponsorship, geographic location, and Carnegie classification. The sample was limited to a survey of the entire faculty of two Associate of Arts colleges and one each Masters I and Masters II colleges. Since the sample size is small, the number of institutions small, and only two institutional types are represented, the ability to generalize may be limited.

## Chapter 2

## Review of the Literature

To understand the concept of faculty autonomy over the curriculum, how and when it came into being, and to what degree, if ever, it was woven into the fabric of higher education, a sense the development of governance and faculty autonomy in American higher education is appropriate. This chapter reviews relevant literature on the curriculum in higher education in America, the influences that the early European universities had on the ideas of governance and autonomy, and literature that addresses internal and external sources of influence on the curriculum identified in this study. The aim is not to re-write a detailed historical analysis of governance and faculty autonomy in the modern university. Libraries and bookstores are graciously endowed with articles, texts, and encyclopedias devoted to just that. Instead, emphasis is placed on the ideas and issues explored in the study as they appear in the chronology of higher education. Significant historical events and trends will be noted in the context of faculty autonomy and the influences of internal and external groups on the curriculum in American higher education.

### A Matter of Perception

"Once upon a time, so legend goes, all was harmony in the American curriculum, a time of accepted values, practices, texts; it was a golden age. This legend is simply wrong" (Carnochan, 1993, p. 1). The struggle over the curriculum is a reflection of the

larger struggle over what the university represents: the ideal and the practical, the old and the new, self-determination or outside influences (Rudolph, 1990).

Some light may be shed on the reasons for the struggle over the curriculum by considering the conflicting issues. The idea that the authority to control the curriculum rests with the faculty lies at the very core of governance in higher education (Rudolph, 1990). In 1966, the American Association of University Professors (1991) stated that "the faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, ...and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process" (p. 161). This idea is so commonly held that it is acknowledged by the National Center for Educational Statistics in its prologue to the 1993 report on the results of the National Study of Post-Secondary Faculty (Zimbler, 1993, Appendix F, p. 2).

On the other hand, many argue that a number of processes have led to a "de-localization" of governance in institutions of higher education (Metzger, 1987, p. 59). The university of today exists in a much more complex environment than the universities at the time of the 1915 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) definition of academic freedom and associated autonomy. At the same time there has been a flow of decisional power to constituencies outside of the university due to an increased sense of constituency ownership and an increase in the complexity of the university. Moreover, the erosion of autonomy has been the result of the faculty as a profession being heavily focused on issues of academic freedom to the neglect of the issues related to autonomy. Due to the increasing complexities of the university in its societal context, faculty and institutions have been so focused on maintaining academic freedom that the

insidious loss of autonomy was overlooked until it was substantially lost (McConnell,1987; Metzger, 1987).

Duryea (1987) places the conversation in context by pointing out there has never been a period of complete autonomy or complete accountability at any time in the history of the modern university. The nature of the autonomy-accountability dualism has always been relative. McConnell (1987) points out that although institutions ought to provide the greatest freedom possible, absolute autonomy is impossible. The university has never escaped from its social context and, as such, faculty autonomy is, and always has been relative.

The condition of the faculty and its role in governance in curriculum is perhaps best summed up in the 1985 report by the Association of American Colleges (AAC) entitled "Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community". In the report the AAC asserts:

> "Faculty curriculum committees suffer from chronic paralysis. They are repositories of great potential power, but they are also pervaded by a great sense of helplessness. Specialized accrediting agencies and professional societies, as well as the examinations for admissions to post-graduate professional schools, hover over the curriculum. State departments of education define the high school curriculum and thereby influence what colleges can and cannot do with theirs. In the case of public institutions, state governing agencies, as the guardians of the educational purse and watchdogs of program duplication, are in a position to overrule faculty decisions. Above all the claim to autonomy by departments and their power to resist unwanted change and to protect their interests, makes serving

on a curriculum committee an exercise in frustration and misdirected energy. (p. 71)

European Beginnings: Rule by the Learner, the Learned, and the Powers that Be

American universities, and their curricula, have been influenced by a number of phenomena spanning both time and continents. Many of the defining characteristics of the American university, including degrees, curricula, faculties, colleges, originated in the medieval universities of Europe (Levine, 1978). Characteristic differences in governance were evident in the two prototypical medieval universities established at Bologna and Paris. These universities founded themselves, rather than being founded, by essentially different groups – students in Bologna and professors in Paris (Domonkos, 1989; Levine, 1978). As such, governance and autonomy at these universities took very different directions.

It is generally accepted that the university is the crowning glory of medieval higher education. These universities came into being as a result of the needs of teachers and students for a protective organization, not the need for a place to meet or a reason to be. These unions of scholars, from the Latin "universitas", meaning union or guild, were formed to protect the scholars themselves from the abuses of the community in which they lived. Another essential function of this organization was to grant a license to teach or what we know today as a "degree". Curricula with formal requirements for the granting of the degree soon followed. Legal incorporation, with an organizational structure of faculties, as areas of study were then known, that were headed by deans, was the next step in the growth of the university (Domonkos, 1989).

Bologna, established in the eleventh century, was an association of students. The

students organized themselves into a guild to protect themselves from the townspeople and the professors. The guild established conditions under which the professors would teach and elected the chief executive officer of the university, himself a student. Civil and canon law was the emphasis in the curriculum although the other faculties: arts, medicine, and theology, would eventually be developed. The professors also formed their own guild, the college, but it was not as powerful as the student "university" (Domonkos, 1989).

In contrast to the university at Bologna, the University of Paris, the greatest of the medieval universities, was founded as a guild of professors to protect themselves and to supervise the granting of the teaching license. The academic orientation was toward theology and the seven liberal arts, known then to be grammar, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. The student body came to be divided by country of origin into Nations within the university (Domonkos, 1989).

This professor-dominated model was to be the rule for the establishment of other universities as the result of the migration of scholars from one area of an increasingly urban Europe to another. Oxford rose spontaneously in the twelfth century in the professor-dominated Paris model. Scholars who migrated from Oxford established Cambridge. The migration of professors from Paris gave rise to the university at Orleans just as Padua arose from Bologna. In these universities, governance and faculty autonomy favored its founding professors (Domonkos, 1989).

It is interesting to note that the "degree" structure was established during this early period of university development. Unlike the modern university, completing the Bachelor of Arts degree, which took four to five years, was not a particularly noteworthy

academic accomplishment. This was merely the first step on the road to higher learning. The degree allowed students to enter into the higher faculties – law, medicine, and theology. With another three to four years of study a student could complete the Masters level which would allow him to teach. The doctoral degree could take as long as sixteen years (Domonkos, 1989).

Later in the history of European universities, the establishment of universities became the purview of the kings and popes. This marks the beginning of government influence on higher education and the loss of autonomy that scholars sought with the earliest guilds. This also begins the dependence of universities on the sustaining resources that the secular and religious leaders provided. This period of growth from the Late Medieval period, through the Renaissance, the Reformation, and Age of Enlightenment saw universities suffer the triumphs and tragedies associated with each period. Shortly after its founding the modern university left its short lived tradition of being an isolated community of scholars and becomes, for better or worse, woven into the larger fabric of society, never to be isolated again (Domonkos, 1989).

The American Experience: Government Governing from the Beginning

In the early years American higher education was influenced by old-world classical education, the pragmatism of a nation of immigrants seeking a better life in the New World and the need in the colonies to educate the clergy and governing class. The ideals and purposes of the individuals or groups that founded institutions played a part as well (Rudolph, 1990). The genesis of the American university, then, is not found in the banding together of scholars, whether professors or students, as was the case in Europe. Instead, they were purposefully founded, local institutions using a model well established

in the English tradition of the university (Duryea, 1987; Rudolph, 1990).

From the beginning the primary mission of the colonial college was that of a teaching institution which provided instruction in classical knowledge and intellectual skills. The American college was such a coveted resource that the relationship between it and colonies is described as "intense, bilateral and cooperative" (Robles, 1994; p. 4). Even though Protestant churches established colonial colleges, there was no real distinction between public and private. They were, in effect, all public colleges (Kerr, 1994; Levine, 1978).

Harvard, the first colonial college in America, was founded in 1636. This event not only marks the beginning of higher education in the United States, but also sets the precedent for local government involvement in the affairs of the college. As evidenced by the "Statutes of Harvard, 1646" and "The Harvard Charter, 1650", the colony in Massachusetts was determined to control what was learned and how the college was to be governed. Faculty had limited freedom in a very prescriptive curriculum. In short, questions of academic and intellectual freedom simply did not arise for the trustees, presidents, or faculty (Duryea, 1987).

By the beginning of the American revolution, fifteen more colleges were established, nine of which are still in existence (Levine, 1978). William and Mary, Yale, King's College, and Dartmouth are notable examples. Until shortly after the American revolution, although fractured somewhat by sectarian differences, the curriculum was a study of the classics and the theology of Christendom. Much of the curriculum was controlled by the mandates of the church that established the institution and the needs of the colony. The curriculum reflected the institutional purpose and a staunch adherence to

a hierarchical system of governance, leaving little room for debate. Faculty filled chairs suited to the curriculum and did not alter the curriculum to suit themselves (Rudolph, 1990; Sloan, 1971).

The absence of specific language in the Constitution of the newly established American republic allowed for considerable latitude in the establishment of educational institutions. Due to the lack of a coherent federal policy on higher education until after World War II, almost any group or individual could found colleges. After the American revolution, the federal government left the establishment of colleges to the states, in effect diminishing its direct control. The transferring of that authority made American higher education fundamentally different than its nationally controlled European counterparts. Colleges were a decentralized group of institutions that were less restrained than the colonial colleges that preceded them. The result was the over-building of colleges, a resistance to standardization, and a weakened higher education (Thelin, 1994).

Despite education being the role of local and state governments, federal government involvement in the curriculum has been constant since shortly after the American Revolution. With the establishment of the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1802, where study centered on the needs of the military and its leaders, the federal government took an early, active, and decisive role in furthering its own interests. In effect, the federal government established both governance and the curriculum at West Point (Rudolph, 1990).

Federal influence continued with the Morill Act of 1862, which promoted both liberal and practical education (Rudolph, 1990; Stark, 1989). Not only did the establishment of land grant universities increase federal influence on the curriculum, but

it also intensified the split between the liberal arts and the professions. These land-grant institutions had the effect of broadening the curriculum to the technical and scientific disciplines, with the rise of related professions. By moving away from the classics, they put science at the center of the curriculum, around which research was generated with an eye toward application. In effect, this federal initiative not only broadened access but also established the academic trilogy of instruction, research, and service. Ultimately, this act resulted in some of America's great universities (Gladieux & King, 1989; Johnson, 1989).

The twentieth century brought increased federal involvement into higher education. Higher levels of funding were provided for areas of the curriculum that furthered the national agenda. The Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, or the GI Bill, brought more vocational training into higher education in a effort to re-tool manpower for peacetime use. National defense and the Cold War brought increasing emphasis on science to the universities and with it came federal research and scholarship dollars (Veysey, 1977). In more recent years government policies fell out of the changing national agenda of an emerging world power, and issues of race, gender, and class (Rudolph, 1990).

The federal government took distinct advantage of the research function shortly after its establishment at American universities in the late nineteenth century and has been purchasing research and development from colleges and universities since the 1880's. These early investments were in the area of agriculture. With the onset of World War II and the launch of Sputnik, federal monies for research increased dramatically. Through the creation of agencies such as National Science Foundation in 1950, federal

dollars were funneled into universities for research in the physical sciences, medicine and defense. As a result, the emphasis in the curriculum drifted away from the professional judgement of the faculty and toward the policies of the federal government (Gladieux and King, 1999).

Outside influence on the curriculum would continue as the federal government addressed the issue of access to higher education. The GI bill fundamentally changed access to higher education from the elite to the masses and was the first in an on-going policy of federal involvement in student aid to education. The act was so successful that it was followed by the Higher Education Act of 1965. This act worked to increase access to the financially needy and those with newly found civil rights. With these types of federal programs came an emphasis in vocational education for retooling those in the military to peacetime work in the late 1940's and 1950's. Later federal aid to students provided for educational opportunities and economic productivity of disadvantaged populations, particularly in the last decade (Gladeiux & King, 1999; Rudolph, 1990).

Despite the historically significant role of state governments in establishing colleges and universities, some measure of protection for autonomy was given by the United States Supreme Court in the Dartmouth Case of 1819. In this case, Dartmouth was viewed as a public institution and under the authority and control of the state. However, the court ruled that private incorporation carried with it a measure of autonomy that was greater for the private college than its state established counterparts. Be that as it may, even in constitutionally autonomous institutions, the influence of the state has ultimately been tied to the appropriations of the governor and state legislatures (McConnell, 1987; Rudolph 1990). The Dartmouth case made clear that colleges would

take on both a public and private persona which eventually would be predominantly private in the eastern colleges (Geiger, 1999).

Although federal government influence is undeniable, the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution, by reserving powers not delegated to the federal government to the states, gives the primary authority for education to the states. Terry Sanford, former governor, U.S. senator, and president of Duke University, put the role of the states in perspective by pointing out that states provide the largest share of funding for higher education with the federal government providing the extras. Historically this has been the case and continues today (Gladieux & King, 1999).

The most far-reaching change in the influence of the state government over the last thirty years is the move from individual institutional governance to the establishment of large, multiple-institution systems. Here state governments influence curriculum through the creation of formal state coordinating boards and governing bodies. These government structures influence the curriculum through a number of functions. The planning function results in a single document or series of reports that establish goals and objectives for the educational institutions. Policy analysis and problem resolution, often authorized by the legislature or governor, may determine performance thresholds, transfer policies, and articulation. Defining institutional missions determines degrees awarded, new degree and program proposals. Academic program review, institutional reports linked to funding, and procedures for performance assessment are also among the requirements of some state governments (McGuinness, 1999).

## Liberal Education and the Rise of the Professional Curriculum

What is meant by the "liberal arts" has been debated since first coined by Cicero

in the first century BC. The term denoted an education of a people who were "free" in the Greek societal context of democracy, as well as the liberating ability to reason and to speak on any topic. Through the centuries scholars debated, and continue to debate, the true meanings, proper approaches, and truest philosophies of the liberal arts. It was however, in the sixth century that some understanding came to the debate with the codification of a liberal education into the seven classically defined liberal arts: grammar, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. The American ideas of general studies, commonly' and perhaps somewhat incorrectly called the liberal arts and sciences, are grounded in this codification. In any case, the preparation in the liberal arts eventually served to prepare the students for advanced studies (Kimball, 1988).

This liberating bent for approaching knowledge would blend in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries with the humanist model of learning, the medieval knight's social etiquette of courtesy, and Christian ethics. The ideal was to produce the "Christian gentleman". The result would be the model for the English university, and subsequently used by the founders of Harvard in 1636, and the eight other colleges founded in the American colonies (Kimball, 1988).

With these classical underpinnings, the nine colonial colleges prepared students to be the educated clergy, disciplined leaders, and cultured men that the future states would require. Despite sectarian differences, these principles would be broadly accepted and incorporated in all of these institutions. As such the curricula of these early American colleges would be grounded in the classics and the principles of Christendom (Rudolph, 1990).

Soon after the colonial period the "Yale Report of 1828" supported the

traditionalists effort to maintain the old order and a strict adherence to the classical curriculum grounded in the liberal arts. Here the classics and mathematics were touted as essential to the preparation of the scholar for educational endeavors. Latin and Greek were the core subjects for the freshman and sophomore years and were considered the foundations for the study of science. They were also seen as required in preparation for the study of law, medicine, ministry, and teaching. The classics were central to the curriculum in higher education just as they were to Western culture itself (Rudolph, 1990; Sloan, 1971)

The report was careful in pointing out that Yale was not a graduate or professional school but was a school that prepared the student for further study. The value of this education was affirmed not only in the content of the courses but also in the mental discipline that the study of the courses required. That is, disciplined study in significant depth required a force of will that was of equal value to the student as the knowledge of languages, dead or otherwise. Of note here is despite the core requirement of Latin and Greek, Yale was already offering French and Spanish as electives to upperclassmen. However, this document reaffirmed the philosophical the foundation for the undergraduate curriculum that has persisted throughout the American liberal arts tradition (Rudolph, 1990; Sloan 1971).

Thomas Jefferson, the most influential early champion of the university ideal, embodied the struggle between the old canon of the curriculum and the new thinkers of the age. Although the basic assumptions of the Yale report were embraced by the major reformers of the time, including Jefferson, many were caught up in the movement toward the ideas of the Age of Enlightenment. Although he saw Latin as the basis for the study

of all sciences, he did away with the teaching of Latin and Greek as a requirement while he was at William and Mary. Eventually he founded the University of Virginia based on an advanced system of electives. At the same time he believed that Latin should be required at every university, but assumed that the classics would be thoroughly taught at the lower grammar schools. This struggle between the classics and the liberal arts would continue at various colleges throughout the pre-Civil War period (Sloan, 1971).

The curriculum in higher education during the period after the American Civil War was dominated by a utilitarian point of view and led to increasing accessibility to higher education, increasing breadth of the curriculum, and further growth toward the contemporary needs of the nation. Ezra Cornell's university, where any student would have the opportunity to study anything, was a clear departure from the old canon. The experiment at Cornell, established in 1865, would be a place where practical and liberal learning would be united, all courses of study would be equal, and there would be no second-class students. Cornell embraced the opportunities that government support of educational expansion provided and became a pacesetter for this new style of university. Despite the success of finding twenty three professors, accepting four hundred students, and having the luxury of rejecting fifty, Cornell was seen as Lucifer incarnate by the well established institutions of the time (Rudolph, 1990; Veysey, 1973).

Eventually, the influence of the German model began to be felt. Inherent in this model was a fundamental idea upon which the principles of academic freedom were built: lehrfreiheit. Lehrfreiheit refers to the absence of administrative influence that allows freedom of inquiry and the freedom to teach within the walls of the university. This idea placed the faculty at the center of the university (Barnett, 1992). With its emphasis on

post-graduate specialization and research, the American research university and its curriculum would become fundamentally different than the institutions grounded in the traditional liberal arts. This difference would become the signature of the Johns Hopkins University at Baltimore and marked the beginning of the American research university. Clark University in 1889, Stanford in 1891, and the University of Chicago in 1892 would soon follow the establishment of Johns Hopkins University (Rudolph, 1990).

In the modern research university the scientific ethos prevailed with a resulting explosion in new knowledge. This knowledge found its way into the curriculum as a natural consequence of the researcher sharing new knowledge in the course of teaching. This also led to specialization in the various areas of study, which would have to displace portions of the old canon. At the same time areas of mathematics, English grammar, and geography would be pushed back into secondary schools by those colleges that would raise their standards for admission (Rudolph, 1990; Veysey, 1973).

By 1910 this idea of a specialized education led to the formal establishment of the academic major. The major-subject has been a sustained feature of the curriculum and has been the focal point of much discussion among faculty. With this development came the firm establishment of the academic department. As for the curriculum in the various majors, a clear trend has been the increasing requirements of the academic major at the expense of the liberal arts (Rudolph, 1990).

Although the professions, primarily theology, law, and medicine, were an integral part of the early colleges, it was not until the latter part of the nineteenth century that the formal education of professionals was raised to the university grade. Areas of professional education expanded to the areas of engineering, business, the applied

sciences and teacher education. With these areas of specialization came the requirement of an increased depth of study. Decisions on the curriculum became those of keeping the liberal arts intact and connected to the professions without diminishing either one (Brubaker & Rudy, 1977).

The final academic break with the traditional canon is manifest in the rise of the very specialized, two-year, community-technical college. The community college traces its roots back to the junior colleges of the early part of the twentieth century where it filled the niche of providing mass college education (Levine, 1989). It was the GI Bill, however, that brought the two-year college into the position that it holds in American higher education today. The primary functions of these colleges were career and compensatory education. These colleges respond to the needs of the businesses and industries in their area and as such are locally funded and controlled (Cohen & Brower, 1989).

Institutions of higher education are accountable to the public that they serve. As such, they are bound to answer to the people who support them. Colleges play an increasingly heavy role in the cultural, social and economic future of the citizens that they serve. The public now expects more programs and services that meet its interests or needs. This is particularly true of community colleges. The cost of building this relationship with the public, however, has been the gradual erosion of faculty autonomy (McConnell, 1987).

## The Elective Curriculum and the Beginning of Student Influence

The idea of the elective curriculum is consistent with lernfreiheit, the second idea of academic freedom, and is the beginning of student influence on the curriculum. This

idea refers to the absence of administrative influence over what a student will learn and places the student at the center of learning (Barnett, 1992). The elective idea can be traced back to Harvard; it winds through the University of Virginia, and is the hallmark of Cornell. Eliot, a president of Harvard University, who championed the idea of the elective curriculum into the late nineteenth century, shared this idea. The elective curriculum shifted a significant amount of the control of the curriculum into the hands of the student by allowing them to vote with their feet (Rudolph, 1990). The influence of students on what courses are taught is illustrated by Stark, Lowther, and Hagherty (1986) who point out that students have shifted from the liberal arts to the professional curricula and that shift shows no signs of abating.

In the 1960's and 1970's a generation of students questioned the social and political mores of the generation before. The civil rights and women's movements began are-thinking of what constitutes knowledge in the curriculum of higher education from perspectives other than that of white males. Although an increased awareness of issues of race, gender and class may have roots in the sixties, the impact on the curriculum was not felt until well into the seventies and eighties (Andersen, 1987; Banks, 1993; Gardner, 1989). Debates on issues of equality and the cultural context of knowledge prevalent in the eighties will continue to influence the curriculum (Eaton, 1991; McIntosh, 1989). Such debates have resulted in changes such as the much publicized substitution of a course entitled "Culture, Ideals and Values" for the single course in western civilization required at Stanford (Wilson, 1999). It is in this context that student influence on the content of the curriculum, which began in the sixties, is manifest. It is out of these movements that the students make their mark on the content of the curriculum by

demanding relevance (Altbach, 1999; Levine, 1978).

The Rise of the Administration and Faculty Professionalism

In the early years of the American college, the president often was the only member of the college staff and was under the strict control of the lay board of directors. Despite his lack of influence, he was responsible for all of the functions of his college including teaching, preaching, fund raising, record keeping and discipline. The contemporary college president, although functioning solely as an administrator, is seen as a position of considerable uncertainty and little real influence. Given the nature of a loosely coupled organization of professionals with considerable talents, a weak presidency may have an important organizational function in successful colleges and universities. In any case, the office of the president was in the beginning, as it has regressed today, one of little real influence on the college (Birnbaum, 1999; Weick, 1991).

However, during the period between the American Civil War and World War II, particularly in the late nineteenth century, college presidents had a significant influence on the nature of their institutions and the curriculum. These "great men" were viewed as heads of corporations with considerable authority to build great institutions. White of Cornell and Eliot at Harvard made their colleges the models for the elective curriculum. Gilman at Johns Hopkins, Harper of Chicago, and Jordan at Stanford all moved their institutions toward the research model and the search for new knowledge, with Gilman paving the way for the graduate university model (Birnbaum, 1999; Trow, 1991; Veysey, 1989).

As a result of the development of the administrative role of the president came the

need for expanded administrative staff. This expansion was in part due to the growth of the multiversity. With that growth came the responsibility for securing public and private funds and for answering to a movement toward ever increasing societal involvement in higher education. The implementation of systems of majors, courses, credit, and admissions also carried increased administrative burdens (Duryea, 1991; Veysey, 1987)

The rise of the administrative structure, beyond the positions of the president and the bursar, was also due in large part to the needs of the students. By the end of the nineteenth century there was an ever-widening gap between the faculty and the students. The loss of a personal relationship between students and the faculty at the continually growing colleges was becoming the rule rather than the exception. Students began to regard faculty as a "necessary evil". Faculty viewed students as an "unavoidable nuisance". Formality, isolation, a lack of communication, and attacks on faculty, at times resulting in death, overshadowed a "thin veneer of politeness" that became the atmosphere of the place. This condition plagued institutions the likes of Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, and Vassar in ways that were unheard of in the past (Veysey, 1989).

Efforts were made to address the problem. Some colleges held faculty teas. The advisor system was instituted at other colleges. The preceptor system was instituted at Princeton. Codes of conduct were put in place in the hope that students would be brought in line. Frequent examinations, instead of those given annually or at commencement, were used to try to keep students focused on academics. All of these remedies failed miserably (Veysey, 1989).

These conditions of need and failure encouraged the rise of the academic administration with its president, deans, and department chairs. The term

"administration" came to be known more as a state of mind, that of management and planning, than a position. By 1910, a formal, frequently autocratic bureaucracy had arrived at the American college. Despite the various forms and personalities that characterized its development a remarkable paradox resulted. Out of the need for a more formal governance structure came, at once, more control on the faculty by a pre-eminent president and less intrusion through further isolation and an administrative a screen of protection. The result was an unintended, yet fairly large, measure of academic autonomy (Duryea, 1991; Veysey, 1989).

The rise of academic professionalism can be traced back to the earliest days of the American colleges and the use of baccalaureate degree graduates as tutors at their respective colleges. These were temporary positions as graduates were on their way to careers in religion or government. Although there were occasional appointments of professors in small numbers, professors did not outnumber tutors until around 1820. With the movement away from the old canon and the development of specialization after the American Civil War, faculty began to see themselves as academic professionals. It was during this period that academic rank found its earliest beginnings in the distinction between "junior faculty" and professors (Finklestein, 1989)

It was in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century that the idea of professional faculty came to maturity. During this period faculty began to view their instructional positions as careers with some sense of permanence. Since they viewed themselves as disciplinary specialists, they published in their disciplines and participated in professional societies. Finally, they undertook activities outside their institutions in consulting, public lecturing, and government

service. This was the point where the faculty further defined the professional roles of teaching, research, and community service (Finkelstein, 1989). This academic professionalism coupled with the AAUP statements concerning the role of faculty were among the factors that led to the educational reform movements between 1900 and 1930 that reacted to the threat of overspecialization (Robles, 1998). This rise in the sense of identity and stature of professional faculty continued until its peak in the early 1960's (Best, 1989).

## Influences from Private and Voluntary Enterprises

During the three and one-half centuries of higher education in America, colleges and universities have been influenced by public, private, and voluntary enterprises that are a part of the larger society. The public enterprise group is comprised of the government groups discussed earlier. Voluntary enterprises are independent, non-profit organizations that provide for schools, hospitals, libraries and the like. The private enterprise sector is made up of the profit seeking businesses and commercial enterprises that provide the funding for the first two. Together they form the umbrella under which external groups, associations, and agencies stand. These groups include athletic conferences to alumni associations and employer associations to unions. College corporate boards also belong in this group (Harcleroad, 1999).

Private foundations have been in the United States since Benjamin Franklin established the American Philosophical Society in 1743. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations were established and set the pattern for the Ford, Kellogg, Johnson foundations that followed. These foundations influenced the curriculum by providing grants of national or international, but carefully

targeted, areas of interest. By providing significant financial support in areas that they choose, private foundations entice supposedly autonomous colleges to pursue areas that they may not otherwise. Although the effect on autonomy is voluntary, it is clear that these foundations have had and will continue to have an effect on higher education (Harcleroad, 1999).

Most academic fields have set up their own voluntary groups or associations. Education, engineering, and allied health are good examples with engineering and allied health having dozens of sub-groups. These types of groups directly influence institutions by their detailed criteria for membership that often specify allocation of resources (faculty, classrooms, laboratories) as well as academic requirements for membership (Harcleroad, 1999; Stark, 1986).

Voluntary accrediting agencies barely existed a century ago. By the end of the nineteenth century four of the six regional associations began establishing voluntary accrediting agencies in response to the turbulence that typified the period from 1870 to 1910. Five factors led to the organizing of voluntary accrediting agencies. Those were the breakdown of the fixed curriculum and increasing electives, the legitimizing of new fields (i.e. psychology, education, American literature), an increase in the types of institutions, the overlapping of secondary and post-secondary education, and the lack of admission and degree standards. These regional accrediting associations dealt primarily with colleges rather than with professional schools or programs. They influenced the curriculum by formally establishing criteria and requirements for membership that established yardsticks for student achievement and college operations (Harcleroad, 1999).

The American Medical Association (AMA), the first of the specialized, discipline-

oriented associations, was established in 1847. The Council on Medical Education of the AMA began rating medical schools from 1905 to 1907 based on percentages of failures on licensure examinations and marked the beginning of discipline oriented approval of schools. A more sophisticated, ten-point inspection system was subsequently developed and resulted in the merger or closing of sixty-five of the one hundred and sixty schools inspected. The AMA experience was emulated quickly and broadly copied. Between 1914 and 1935, fifteen professional disciplinary and service organizations were established in areas from music to business, engineering to law and four medically related fields. From 1935 to 1948 six associations in liberal arts and theology and four more medically oriented associations were established. This expansion continued through 1975 with the establishment of twenty-five subspecialties, particularly in allied health. This is an example of where intrusion on autonomy is beneficial, particularly in the area of benchmarking for assessment of program outcomes in professional programs (Cambridge, 1999; Harcleroad, 1999).

These external associations directly influenced institutions and programs by delineating curriculum, degrees offered, faculty, staffing, space, teaching methods and loads, and examination performance. Entry into credentialing systems and limiting of licenses to professional practice in states are typically based on accreditation. The accessibility of federal financial aid also hinges on regional accreditation. As such these accrediting agencies represent a major form of private constituency with direct impact on higher education. (Harcleroad, 1999).

Institutionally based associations are voluntary membership organizations, typically set up by institutional officials for their own purposes. They provide a vehicle

for political action when they work together as a united front and are typically based in Washington, D.C. The American Council on Education, American Association of Colleges and Universities, American Association of Community Colleges, are but a few (Harcleroad, 1999).

Regional compacts are nonprofit, private, quasi-governmental organizations voluntarily entered into by academic institutions. These organizations include the Southern Regional Educational Board, the Western Interstate Compact for Higher Education, the New England Board for Higher Education, and the Midwestern Higher Education Commission. Although these organizations first developed to meet educational needs, particularly medical, dental, and veterinary education, across state lines, these organizations have influenced institutions through regional conferences on critical topics, workshops, seminars, and research and statistical studies. Through shared resources, the compacts have improved student access to educational programs while decreasing costs to the participating states (Harcleroad, 1999).

Private, voluntary groups generally have a significant impact on the institutions that they serve. For the most part, the impact is positive. However, it is clear that these groups, and the employers, professional organizations, public special interest groups that they represent, have both direct and indirect influence on the curricula of the institutions that seek their association. They continue a tradition of direct action of voluntary citizen groups that is likely to endure into the foreseeable future (Harcleroad, 1987; Stark & Lattuca, 1997).

## More Recent Issues

Lazerson (1997) poses the larger question of ownership of institutions of higher

education as a prelude to reflections on his experience with the increasing role of boards of trustees in higher education. As expected, questions of autonomy are raised and discussed in view of increasing infringement. This question of owner is at the center of the nature of the conflicts over curriculum and contentious ownership.

Peters (1994) notes that little agreement exists among professors, students, public officials, the public, or employers on what a student should have learned upon exiting college. This agreement, he notes, is foundational to the assessment of students and higher education as well. Since there is little agreement, faculty have legitimate reasons to resist demands for accountability when there is such broad ownership in the curriculum. He also points out that standardized exams further erode faculty authority and morale while narrowing the curriculum.

Through the control of finances, by enactment of legislation related to higher education, and by an ever-increasing sense of public ownership of the university, federal, state, and local governing bodies have developed a larger sense of ownership in colleges and universities. Fueled by decreasing funding and increasing distrust of higher education in general, mandates to assess, report, and be accountable for educational outcomes continue to put pressure on the curriculum to be more flexible (Gardner, 1977). At the same time the trend toward outcome based accreditation and the tying of financial aid dollars to accreditation increases encroachment of others into the affairs of the faculty.

It is clear that external agencies will continue to become more involved in the governance over what the student will be taught. Debates over the loss of a common understanding of what constitutes foundational knowledge and a contextual curriculum responsive to the need for diversity and inclusivity, leaves the university divided and

under fire. The perception of the declining value of the bachelor's degree invites external interference and internal debate. The inability of the faculty to identify and establish coherence and integrity in the college curriculum is said to reflect the disarray, confusion, conflict, and lack of purpose throughout the institutions themselves (Bloom, 1987; Kimball, 1988). The apparent historical and recent misunderstandings, or perhaps various uninformed understandings, of where governance over the curriculum lies continues. As a result, individual scholars, and institutions as a whole, have historically found themselves embroiled in conflicts over ideas at the very heart of the university (Harvard, 1992; Searle, 1990).

Wilson (1999) discusses the various influences on the curriculum in light of the current and future culture wars played out on college campuses. His conclusions are as follows:

> College curriculum in the social sciences is no longer a matter of internal debate and expertise but is, instead, manifestly political. The expert status of faculty has been undermined by attacks on them as ideologues, imposing their political ideas on students. At Stanford, Yale, Georgetown, and in smaller fights across the country, the curriculum has become an object of public debate. Although the arguments have sometimes been far from enlightening, they do show that the curriculum can no longer be hidden in the ivory tower. For better or worse, curricular matters will not be determined in faculty meetings; a wide range of actors, from trustees to alumni donors to university presidents to the media, will have their say in the matter (p. 444).

In keeping with the history of higher education, the conclusions of the scholars of the

day, and the predictions for the future of higher education in America, influence over the curriculum in higher education has been, and is likely to remain, broadly distributed.

## Chapter 3

## Methodology

This chapter describes the methodology used in the study. The sample of institutions and faculty is described followed by a description of the survey instrument. The section concludes with a description of the analysis in terms of the data.

### Sample

The faculty of four colleges were surveyed using a questionnaire (n = 489). The two state colleges surveyed fit in the 1994 Carnegie Associate of Arts College classification. One private college surveyed fit in the Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I classification. One private college surveyed fit in the Masters (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges II classification. Two of the colleges, one each state technical and private liberal arts, were located in close proximity to one another in a northern, mid-west state. The two remaining colleges were located in close proximity to one another in a coastal, southeastern state. Both of the Associate of Arts colleges included were heavily involved in technical education, and were part of state-supported, public college systems. Both of the master's degrees granting institutions were private, religiously affiliated, liberal arts colleges that were founded as women's colleges. One remains primarily a college for women while the other is a co-educational institution.

## The Survey Instrument

A survey instrument in the form of a questionnaire was refined from one used in a smaller pilot study conducted by the author. The pilot questionnaire was constructed using items patterned after the National Survey of Post-secondary Faculty and items that reflected the experience of the author in the area of post-secondary, professional curricula in various academic settings. The items that address the perceptions of faculty influence on courses offered and course content were patterned after those found on the National Survey of Post-secondary Faculty (Zimbler, 1993; Appendix I, p. 5). The items that addressed the influence of outside groups were refined from a previous pilot study conducted by the author. They were designed address the questions of the study in view of the literature in the field.

The pilot survey was used once and in only two institutions not included in the study. The alternatives in the items were changed from percentages in the pilot questionnaire to the more general responses in the final questionnaire. Demographic questions included on the final questionnaire were not in the pilot questionnaire. Although refined and reviewed by the author and the dissertation committee, the refined questionnaire (Appendix A) was used without benefit of a subsequent pilot study. As such, the author recognizes the need to view the results in light of the challenge to validity that results from the lack of a pilot study with the final version of the questionnaire.

The refined questionnaire was used to investigate faculty perceptions of how much influence outside groups have on courses and course content. The instrument also asked the faculty to judge the level of influence of these groups on courses offered and on

course content. Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership and the School of Public Health at the University of South Carolina Columbia reviewed the questionnaire for content validity.

Likert scales were used on questions one through eight of the instrument. Responses were then encoded into the database by assigning numbers to each response in each item. The number one was assigned to the lowest amount of influence ("none"), the lowest level of influence ("very low"), and the lowest level of satisfaction ("very dissatisfied"). The number five was assigned to the highest amount of influence ("total") and the highest level of influence ("very high"). The number four was assigned to the highest level of satisfaction ("very satisfied") since there were only four alternatives in the scale.

Questions one, three, five and seven asked faculty to indicate the amount of influence that either they or other groups have on courses offered by their department or course content. Specifically, faculty were asked "How much influence do..." they or other groups "...have on decisions about what courses will be offered by your department." Faculty were asked to circle one response from the alternatives "none", "light", "moderate", "heavy", and "total". None of the questions asked for an argument, justification, or evidence to support their selection. The answers, then, are the faculty perception of the amount of influence.

Questions two and four asked the faculty to judge the level of influence of outside groups based on the amount of influence selected on the previous question. Specifically, they were asked "Given your response to..." the previous question "...how would you describe the level of influence of each group?" They were asked to circle one response

from the alternatives "very low", "low", "about right", "high", and "very high". Again, the answers are perceptions, not necessarily fact.

Questions six and eight ask about the levels of satisfaction with the authority that the faculty have on decisions about courses offered and course content. Specifically they were asked "How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the authority that you have to make decisions about ..." courses taught or content and methods. They were asked to circle one response from the alternatives "very satisfied", "somewhat dissatisfied", "somewhat satisfied", and "very satisfied".

Items nine through twelve, categorical demographic items, were encoded using whole numbers up to the number necessary to include all responses in the item. Items thirteen through fifteen required that the respondents write in responses. The responses to Item 13, "Academic discipline or field", were entered into the database verbatim. Responses to Item 14, "Number of years...in higher education?", were entered into the database as written, with half years rounded up to the next whole number. Data entry for Item 15, which asked "How old are you?" was treated in the same manner as Item 14.

The first page of each questionnaire served as the cover letter. Instructions and an agreement to keep individual responses confidential were included. Each questionnaire was numbered to identify the respondent so non-respondents could be re-surveyed. An individual at each institution distributed and collected the questionnaires. Non-respondents were resurveyed once after the first distribution. Although the respondents were instructed to circle their responses to each question, items in which the responses were clearly underlined, checked or crossed instead of circled were included in the data set.

Questionnaires were distributed in the summer and fall of 1997. The questionnaires were numbered to protect the identity of the respondent as much as possible and still allow for a follow-up survey if necessary. The faculty were given two weeks to respond. If the questionnaire was not returned in two weeks, another copy was sent to non-respondents.

## Analysis in Terms of the Data

SPSS version 8.0 for Windows was used for the statistical analysis. First, the data were analyzed to see how much influence the faculty perceived they exercise on the curriculum (Research Question 1). The data were then analyzed to determine faculty perception of the influence that students, college administration, the government, the public, employers of graduates, licensing agencies, and professional organizations exercise on curriculum (Research Question 2). Descriptive statistics and frequencies were used to address these questions.

Chi-square technique was used to test for independence in the remaining questions except for age and years in higher education where regression was used. Data were examined to see if faculty perception of how much influence other groups exercise on curriculum was independent of the perceived level of influence that outside groups have on curriculum (Research Question 3). Next, the data were examined to see if faculty perception of the level of influence of outside groups on the curriculum was independent of institutional type (Research Question 4). Finally, the data were examined to see if faculty perception of influence on the curriculum was independent of faculty characteristics (Research Question 5).

## Chapter 4

## Results

The purpose of chapter 4 is to describe and discuss the results of the study. It is organized by first describing the overall results of the study. Then discussion of the statistical analysis for each research question is provided. The chapter concludes with a more detailed discussion of the patterns of response that emerge from a close examination of the contingency tables.

As a rule, patterns of response will be described by mentioning the category with the highest percent response first, followed by the next most frequent response. When there is a mix of high frequency categories among faculty groups or characteristics that establish a pattern then the response categories will be noted in no particular order. A range will be used where percent responses are fairly close. Notably high values within a range of responses or among categories will be mentioned as the need for emphasis arises. The purpose here is not to give a detailed analysis of each and every percent seen in the contingency tables. The purpose is to describe the nature of the faculty perceptions of influence when chi-square indicates independence or contingency.

Examination of Appendix E, Table A, is an example of how the data are interpreted. The public, two-year community college faculty perceived public influence as "light", to "none", the highest percent to the next highest percent. Masters-degree, liberal arts and sciences college faculty perceived public influence as "none" to "light",

highest percent to next highest percent. Faculty perception public and government influence is "none" or "light", where the highest percentages are mixed between the two categories. Where percent responses are similar, and where there is a notably high percent among similar percents, a range will be given and the highest percent category or categories pointed out. For example, in the same table, public, two-year community college faculty perceived student influence from "light" to "heavy", with "light" the most frequent response.

A note concerning how chi-square is used in this study is appropriate since the meaning of significance in chi-square is different in research question three than research questions four and five. In research question three, chi-square is used to see if there are relationships of the perceptions of the same respondents between different questions. Specifically, each respondent is asked to rate the level of influence, items two and four on the questionnaire, based on their rating of the amount of influence, items one and three of the questionnaire. Chi-square compares questions in research question three. Independence or contingency would exist between questions.

In research questions four and five, chi-square is used to compare answers to the same question by faculty with differing characteristics. Faculty were asked to rate the influence of outside groups in the same question and selected out of the sample selected based on institutional type or characteristic for chi-square analysis. Chi-square compares the responses of faculty with different characteristics to the same question in research questions four and five. Independence or contingency would be related to faculty characteristics.

## General Findings

The questionnaire entitled "Faculty Questionnaire on Influence on the Curriculum" (Appendix A) was distributed to the faculty of the previously described institutions (n = 489). A 69.9 percent response rate resulted from the return of 342 questionnaires. Due to the number of significantly incomplete questionnaires (n = 21) the final response rate was 65.6 percent (n = 321). Of the 321 questionnaires, 39.9 percent (n = 128) came from the Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I and II classifications, with the remaining 60.1 percent (n = 193) of the surveys coming from the two Associate of Arts Colleges. Examination of the responses by region revealed that 50.5 percent (n = 159) of the responses were from the colleges in the northern, mid-west state with 49.5 percent (n = 162) from the coastal, southeastern state.

Liberal arts and science faculty represented 46.4 percent (n = 149) of the sample with the remaining being professional or technical faculty. Females accounted for 60.3 percent (n = 191) of the sample. The mean age of the faculty was 46.0 years (SD = 9.1) with a low age of 26 years and the high at 75 years. The mean number of years in higher education was 14.0 (SD = 8.9) with a high of 50 years. An overwhelming majority, 91.6 percent (n = 294), of the faculty were white, non-Hispanic. Tenured faculty represented 38.9 percent of the faculty. The majority of the faculty, 58.0 percent (n = 185) held the rank of instructor, with 15.7 percent (n=50) at the rank of assistant professor, 10.0 percent (n = 32) at the rank of associate professor, 11.0 percent (n = 35) at the rank of professor, and 5.3 percent (n = 17) unranked.

Data from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), Digest of Education Statistics (U.S. Department of Education, 1999) are used here to compare the

study sample to the larger national survey. According to the NCES report 43.6 percent of the faculty are from the arts and sciences, 54 percent of the faculty range in age from 40 to 54 years, with a midpoint of 47 years, and white, non-Hispanic faculty represented 87.1 percent of the sample. However, the gender, tenure, and rank characteristics in the sample were quite different than the NCES report. Females represented 33.2 percent of the faculty and approximately 65 percent were tenured. Only 12.1 percent of the faculty held the rank of instructor, while 23.5 percent were assistant professors, 22.7 percent were associate professors, and 28.9 were professors.

The differences can be explained, in part, by noting the differences in the sample. The sample for this study did not include research type universities where the preponderance of faculty are males with rank and tenure. Community colleges do not typically differentiate faculty according to rank nor do they offer tenure-track as a condition of employment. The difference in these characteristics would be expected given that the majority of the faculty in this sample were from two-year, community colleges. The high percentage of females in this sample may be explained by the high number of programs in the health care professions where historically there is a preponderance of females, particularly in nursing and the health professions in general.

Research Question 1: How much influence do faculty perceive that they have on the curriculum in higher education?

Just over 61 percent of the faculty responded "heavy" or "total" to the amount of influence they have on courses offered (Table 1). The amount of influence on courses offered is rated as "heavy" by 50.9 percent of the faculty and "total" by another 9.3 percent. Of the remaining 39.3 percent of the faculty, 28.3 percent saw their influence as "moderate" with the remaining 12.1 percent, choosing "none" or "light".

When divided by institutional type and faculty characteristics, again the largest percentage of the faculty responded "heavy" or "total". When considering institutional type, 56.2 percent of public, two-year college and 66.6 percent of the private, masters degree college faculty answered "total' or "heavy". Professional/technical (PT) and liberal arts and science (LAS) faculties perceived "heavy" or "total" influence at 62.2 percent and 60.6 percent respectively. Tenured faculty and non-tenured answered 68.8 percent and 54.4 percent respectively. Both females, 55.2 percent, and males, 70.0 percent, perceived "heavy" or "total" influence over courses offered as did minorities, 69.2 percent, and white, non-Hispanic faculty, 59.4 percent.

Faculty perception of the amount of influence on content and methods is similar to that found on courses taught but with more "heavy" and "total" responses. Again, the majority of the faculty perceived that they heavily or totally influence content and methods (Table 2). The amount of influence on course content and methods is rated as "heavy" by 63.9 percent of the faculty and "total" by another 16.5 percent. Only 15.6 percent of the

faculty saw their influence as "moderate" with the remaining 3.4 percent, choosing

Table 1

Percent Response for Faculty Influence on Courses Offered by Institutional Type and Faculty Characteristics.

| | N | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Faculty | 320 | 3.4 | 8.7 | 28.3 | 50.9 | 9.3 |
| | | | Institutional Type | | | |
| Two-year, public | 194 | 3.6 | 10.8 | 29.4 | 47.4 | 8.8 |
| Masters, private | 126 | 0.8 | 5.6 | 27.0 | 56.3 | 10.3 |
| | | | Faculty Characteristic | | | |
| Professional/ Technical | 170 | 2.9 | 7.6 | 28.2 | 50.0 | 11.2 |
| Liberal Arts and Sciences | 149 | 2.0 | 9.4 | 28.9 | 52.3 | 7.4 |
| Tenured | 125 | 2.4 | 4.0 | 24.8 | 59.2 | 9.6 |
| Non-tenured | 193 | 2.6 | 11.9 | 31.1 | 45.1 | 9.3 |
| Minority | 126 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 23.1 | 65.4 | 3.8 |
| White, non Hispanic | 190 | 2.7 | 8.9 | 29.9 | 49.5 | 9.9 |
| Female | 190 | 3.2 | 12.1 | 29.5 | 44.7 | 10.5 |
| Male | 125 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 27.0 | 61.1 | 7.9 |

Note. Row percentage totals less than 100 are due to missing data.
n < 321 indicates missing data.

Table 2

Percent Response for Faculty Influence on Course Content by Institutional Type and Faculty Characteristics.

| | N | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Faculty | 320 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 15.6 | 63.9 | 16.5 |
| | | | Institutional Type | | | |
| Two-year, public | 193 | 0.5 | 4.1 | 21.2 | 58.3 | 12.4 |
| Masters, private | 126 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 7.9 | 67.5 | 23.0 |
| | | | Faculty Characteristic | | | |
| Professional/ Technical | 170 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 13.5 | 68.8 | 15.3 |
| Liberal Arts and Sciences | 148 | 0.3 | 4.1 | 18.9 | 58.1 | 18.2 |
| Tenured | 125 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 10.4 | 67.2 | 21.6 |
| Non-tenured | 192 | 0.3 | 4.7 | 19.3 | 58.6 | 13.5 |
| Minority | 26 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 15.4 | 63.7 | 17.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 292 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 23.1 | 65.4 | 7.7 |
| Female | 190 | 0.3 | 4.2 | 16.3 | 65.3 | 13.7 |
| Male | 125 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 16.0 | 62.4 | 20.8 |

Note. Row percentage totals less than 100 are due to missing data.
$n < 321$ indicates missing data.

"none" or "light".

This shift toward "heavy" and "total" influence is repeated when examining institutional type and faculty characteristics. When considering institutional type, 70.7 percent of public, two-year college and 90.5 percent of the private, masters degree college faculty answered "total' or "heavy". Professional/technical faculty (PT) and liberal arts and science (LAS) faculty perceived "heavy" or "total" influence at 84.1 percent and 76.3 percent respectively. Tenured faculty and non-tenured answered 88.8 percent and 72.1 percent respectively. Seventy nine percent of the females surveyed and, 83.2 percent of the males, perceived "heavy" or "total" influence over courses offered as did minorities, 81.2 percent, and non-minorities, 73.1 percent.

Due to the number of categories, the responses by the academic rank characteristic are shown separately in Tables 3 and 4. The trends shown in the previous faculty characteristics persist for the academic rank characteristic for courses offered as well as course content. Instructors responded "heavy" or "total" at 53.5 percent, assistant professors at 62.0 percent, associate professors at 75.0 percent, and professors at 80.0 percent for courses offered (Table 3). There was, as expected from the trends seen on previous characteristics, an increase in the perception of "heavy" or "total" influence for course content and methods. Instructors responded "heavy" or "total" at 74.4 percent, assistant professors at 90.0 percent, associate professors at 87.5 percent, and professors at 94.8 percent (Table 4). It should be noted here that 5.2 percent of the faculty responded "other" to the question on academic rank. These respondents hold ranks such as clinical instructors or adjunct instructors.

Table 3

Percent Response for Perceived Amount of Faculty Influence on Courses Offered by Academic Rank.

| Rank | N | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instructor | 185 | 3.8 | 11.9 | 30.6 | 47.0 | 6.5 |
| Assistant Professor | 50 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 30.0 | 56.0 | 6.0 |
| Associate professor | 32 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 21.9 | 62.5 | 12.5 |
| Professor | 35 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 17.1 | 60.0 | 20.0 |
| Others | 17 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 23.5 |

Table 4

Percent Response for Perceived Amount of Faculty Influence on Course Content by Academic Rank .

| Rank | N | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instructor | 184 | 0.5 | 4.9 | 20.1 | 63.0 | 11.4 |
| Assistant Professor | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 78.0 | 12.0 |
| Associate professor | 32 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 9.4 | 62.5 | 25.0 |
| Professor | 35 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 57.1 | 37.1 |
| Others | 17 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.5 | 52.9 | 23.5 |

Research Question 2: How much influence, if any, do faculty perceive that groups outside of the faculty have on the curriculum in higher education?

Faculty perception of the influence that groups outside of the faculty have on curriculum is varied but tends toward moderation. With respect to courses offered by the department (Table 5), the bulk of the faculty response was widely spread from "light" to "heavy" in their perception of student, college administration, employer, and professional organization influence. The majority of faculty, 66.7 percent, responded "light" to "none" to the influence that the public has on the courses offered with 56.7 percent responding "light" to "none" for government influence. The influence of licensing agencies was mixed with 22.7 percent responding "none" and 56.1 percent responding "heavy" to "moderate". The highest "total" response, although relatively small at 7.2 percent, was to licensing agencies.

Faculty perception of the amount of influence that outside groups exercise on course content (Table 6) showed most of the faculty response varied widely from "light" to "heavy" for the public, government groups, and licensing agencies. In a response similar to courses offered, 68.8 percent of the faculty responded "none" to "light" for government influence, and 74.8 percent responded "light" to "none" for public influence. Licensing agency response was again mixed from "heavy" to "moderate", at 54.9 percent, on one end of the scale and "none" to "light" on the other end. Students were perceived as having "moderate" to "light" influence with 77.6 percent of the responses. The college administration response centered on "light" to "moderate" at 70.4 percent. Employer and professional organization influence was widely spread between "none" and "heavy".

Table 5

Percent Response for Faculty Perception of Amount Outside Group Influence on Courses Offered

| Group | n | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | 318 | 15.6 | 30.5 | 29.0 | 24.0 | 0.9 |
| College Administration | 320 | 6.9 | 32.4 | 32.7 | 24.6 | 3.1 |
| Local, state, or Federal govt. | 319 | 27.4 | 29.3 | 22.7 | 17.4 | 2.5 |
| Public | 316 | 31.5 | 35.2 | 22.4 | 8.7 | 0.6 |
| Employers | 321 | 14.0 | 24.3 | 34.0 | 24.3 | 3.4 |
| Licensing Agencies | 319 | 22.7 | 13.4 | 20.9 | 35.2 | 7.2 |
| Professional Organizations | 320 | 19.9 | 25.2 | 28.7 | 23.7 | 2.2 |

Note. Row percentage totals less than 100 are due to missing data.
n < 321 indicates missing data.

Table 6

Percent Response for Faculty Perception of Amount of Outside Group Influence on Course Content.

| Group | n | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | 318 | 10.6 | 31.7 | 40.5 | 9.7 | 1.2 |
| College Administration | 321 | 18.7 | 45.8 | 24.6 | 9.3 | 1.6 |
| Local, state, or Federal govt. | 319 | 30.8 | 38.0 | 19.9 | 11.5 | 0.0 |
| Public | 321 | 34.3 | 40.5 | 19.6 | 5.0 | 0.6 |
| Employers | 321 | 15.6 | 24.0 | 34.0 | 22.1 | 4.4 |
| Licensing Agencies | 321 | 24.6 | 16.2 | 21.5 | 33.4 | 5.3 |
| Professional Organizations | 320 | 20.2 | 21.5 | 32.1 | 24.0 | 1.9 |

Note. Row percentage totals less than 100 are due to missing data.
n < 321 indicates missing data.

Research Question 3: Is the faculty perception of the level of influence of outside groups independent of how much influence outside groups have on the curriculum in higher education?

Item 1 was paired with item 2 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A) to measure faculty perception of the amount influence outside groups have on courses offered compared to the level of influence. The chi-square statistic was used to determine if faculty perception of the amount of influence outside groups have on courses offered was independent of faculty perception of the level of influence. The results of chi-square analysis was significant for all groups ($p < .05$) and so the null hypothesis of independence of responses between paired questions was be rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis of contingency. That is, the responses to the paired questions are not independent but the response to one item is somehow related to the response to the other item. At the same time, the correlation coefficients for the paired items (Appendix B, Table A) were also very high and significant for all groups ($p < .05$). A summary of chi-square analyses for the paired items on the faculty perception of the amount of influence on courses offered is shown in Table 7.

Item 3 was paired with item 4 to determine if the faculty perception of how much, or the amount of influence, was independent of the level of influence outside groups have on course content. Chi-square analysis was used to determine if amount of influence outside groups have on course content is independent of the perceived level of influence. Again, chi-square analysis was significant for all groups ($p < .05$) and so the null hypothesis of independence of responses between paired questions was rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. That is, the responses to the paired questions are not

Table 7

Summary of Chi-square for Faculty Perceptions of the Amount of Outside Group Influence by Level of Influence on Courses Offered.

| Group | N | $\chi^2$ | df |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students | 321 | 249.8* | 16 |
| College administration | 319 | 271.4* | 16 |
| Government | 315 | 329.1* | 16 |
| Public | 315 | 287.8* | 16 |
| Employers | 320 | 278.3* | 16 |
| Licensing agencies | 319 | 349.3* | 16 |
| Professional organizations | 320 | 319.5* | 16 |

Note. n < 321 indicate missing data.
*p < .05. **p < .01.

independent but the response to one item is somehow related to the response to the other item. Again, the correlation coefficients (Appendix B, Table B) were also high and significant for all groups ($p < .05$). A summary of chi-square for faculty perceptions of the level of influence on course content are shown in Table 8.

In view of the very high correlation coefficients and extremely high chi-square values for all of the comparisons, caution should be used in placing a great deal of confidence in the alternative hypothesis of contingency. Specifically, there may be an underlying reason for the high correlation coefficients that is grounded in potentially flawed items that are not seen as distinctly different by the faculty. Although faculty could be responding that "none" in the amount of influence truly is a level that is perceived to be "very low", perhaps lower than it should be, there is the possibility that they are seeing the questions as two versions of the same question. Specifically, "how much influence" in items 1 and 3 of the questionnaire may be seen as the same as "the level of influence" in items 2 and 4. In this case, the logical response to a paired question when the response to the first question was "none" would be "very low".

The same suspicion is raised for faculty responding "total" in the amount of influence and perceiving the level as "very high". Although they could be perceiving that a "total" or "heavy" amount of influence is perceived to be at a "very high" level, perhaps higher than it should be, they may also be seeing the paired items as two versions of the same question. Again, the logical response to a paired question when the response to the first question was "total" would be "very high".

The faculty may not be seeing differences in the paired items either due to similarities in the stems of the items or similarities in the alternatives. In either of the

Table 8

Summary of Chi-square for Faculty Perceptions of the Amount of Influence of Outside Groups by Level of Influence on Course Content.

| Group | N | $\chi^2$ | df |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students | 318 | 323.3* | 16 |
| College administration | 321 | 356.1* | 16 |
| Government | 318 | 235.6* | 12[a] |
| Public | 319 | 345.6* | 16 |
| Employers | 321 | 478.8* | 16 |
| Licensing agencies | 321 | 451.8* | 16 |
| Professional organizations | 319 | 423.4 | 16 |

Note. [a]n = 0 in the "total" response on the questionnaire for this group n < 321 indicate missing data.
*p < .05.

cases cited, if the items were seen as two versions of the same question then the answers would tend to cluster about the diagonals of the contingency tables and correlation coefficients would be significant. In this case, significant correlation would not necessarily result from relationships in faculty judgements about influence. Instead, the strong correlation would be created by logical response due to similarities in the paired questions.

Since the chi-square statistic compares expected frequencies and proportions with those observed in a contingency table, responses clustered in cells along a diagonal, where the responses may be associated by logic alone, would result in unexpectedly high numbers in those cells. In this study, these high numbers would be seen along the diagonal from the "none" by "very low" cell to the "total" by "very high" cell (Table 9). In the same way, disproportionately low numbers are likely in the extreme cells in the opposite diagonal, that is from the "none" by "very high" cell to the "total" by "very low" cell. Given the potential for a disproportionate distribution of responses along the diagonal due to logical association, rather than responses due to faculty perceptions of influence, a significant chi-square would be expected. As such, the results of chi-square analysis should be interpreted with caution, as it is possible that the results could lead to incorrect conclusions about contingency.

The cautious interpretation of the results of chi-square and correlation coefficients does not eliminate the possibility that the faculty did see the questions and alternatives as distinctly different. Although there may be similarities in some of the terms in the item stems and the alternatives, it is likely that "about right" is a distinct enough alternative to allow the respondents to make a value judgement on that particular level of influence

Table 9

Contingency Table for Amount of Influence of College Administration on Courses Offered by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 10 | 6 | 5 | 1 | | 22 |
| | 45.5 | 27.3 | 22.7 | 4.5 | | 6.9 |
| | 58.8 | 12.2 | 2.8 | 2.0 | | |
| | 3.1 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 0.3 | | |
| Light | 7 | 35 | 60 | 2 | | 104 |
| | 6.7 | 33.7 | 57.7 | 1.9 | | 32.6 |
| | 41.2 | 71.4 | 33.7 | 4.0 | | |
| | 2.2 | 11.0 | 18.8 | 0.6 | | |
| Moderate | | 6 | 84 | 11 | 3 | 104 |
| | | 5.8 | 80.8 | 10.6 | 2.9 | 32.6 |
| | | 12.4 | 47.2 | 22.0 | 12.0 | |
| | | 1.9 | 26.3 | 3.4 | 0.9 | |
| Heavy | | 2 | 29 | 33 | 15 | 79 |
| | | 2.5 | 36.7 | 41.8 | 19.0 | 24.8 |
| | | 4.1 | 16.3 | 66.0 | 60.0 | |
| | | 0.6 | 9.1 | 10.3 | 4.7 | |
| Total | | | | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| | | | | 30.0 | 70.0 | 3.1 |
| | | | | 6.0 | 28.0 | |
| | | | | 0.9 | 2.2 | |
| Column Total | 17 | 49 | 178 | 50 | 25 | 319 |
| | 5.3 | 15.4 | 55.8 | 15.7 | 7.8 | 100.0 |

That is, it seems reasonable to judge that faculty know at what point "how much" is "about right".

Although it is difficult to discern what amounts of influence are at levels that are too high or too low, a little over half of the faculty perceive what amounts of influence are at a level that is "about right". An average of the column totals of the "about right" responses from the tables in Appendices C and D show that 51.5 percent of the faculty responded "about right" to the various amounts of influence for the groups on the questionnaire. Of those who responded "about right", 81.8 percent answered "moderate", "light", or "none" for the level of influence of outside groups on courses offered. Of those who answered "about right" for the level of influence of outside groups on courses content, 89.3 percent responded "moderate", "light" or "none".

When the contingency tables are examined more closely there are patterns of response that emerge. A fairly consistent pattern of moderation prevailed throughout the contingency tables showing amount of influence by levels of influence. The most frequent answer to the amount of influence was "light" and "moderate", with a corresponding perceived level of influence of "about right". Specifically, a "moderate" level of influence was most frequently perceived to be "about right" in eight of the fourteen tables on faculty perception of the level of influence on courses offered and course content. An example of these patterns can be seen in Table 9. A review of the contingency tables for faculty perception of influence on courses offered (Appendix C) and course content (Appendix D) for each outside group also demonstrates this pattern.

Another consistent finding in the contingency tables is that the percent response for "total" influence of outside groups is consistently low (see Appendix C, Table F).

The highest cumulative (row total) response for "total" is 7.2 percent in the perception of licensing agency influence on courses offered. The cumulative response (row total) for "heavy" is less than 25 percent in all of the tables except for the perception of licensing agencies influence on courses offered, 35.4 percent, and course content, 32.4 percent.

Research Question 4: Is faculty perception of the influence of outside groups on higher education independent of institutional type?

Responses from the two public, community colleges (n = 194) were compared to the responses from the two private, liberal arts colleges (n = 127). The chi-square test was used to determine if the amount of influence on courses offered and course content was independent of institutional type ($p < .05$). The results (Table 10) showed that faculty perception of the amount of influence of college administration, government, the public, employers, and professional organizations on courses offered is not independent of institutional type ($p < .05$). Faculty perception of the amount of influence that students, college administration, government, employers, and professional organizations have on course content is not independent of institutional type ($p < .05$). Therefore, faculty perception of the amount of influence for these groups differs by institutional type.

Although chi-square analysis indicates when comparisons are similar or different, it does not show exactly how the comparisons are similar or different. On examination of the contingency tables for each of the institutional types, patterns emerge in the percent response for each amount of influence. In general, the faculty perceived that outside groups have more influence on the courses offered than course content. The tables in Appendix E summarize the percent response from the contingency tables.

There are similarities in the response patterns of the two-year, community college (TYCC) faculty and the masters, liberal arts college (MLAC) faculty to the amount of influence of outside groups on courses offered (Appendix E, Table A). Faculty from

Table 10

Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Outside Group Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Institutional Type.

| Group | n | $\chi^2$ | df |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Courses Offered | | |
| Students | 321 | 2.83 | 4 |
| College administration | 320 | 34.52* | 4 |
| Government | 319 | 18.91* | 4 |
| Public | 316 | 15.07* | 4 |
| Employers | 321 | 12.19* | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 319 | 5.97 | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 320 | 14.72* | 4 |
| | Course Content | | |
| Students | 318 | 10.50* | 4 |
| College administration | 321 | 20.89* | 4 |
| Government | 319 | 15.64* | 4 |
| Public | 321 | 9.17 | 4 |
| Employers | 321 | 18.66* | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 321 | 2.75 | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 320 | 11.20* | 4 |

Note. $n < 321$ is due to missing data.
*$p < .05$.

TYCC and MLAC perceive student influence on courses offered as "light" to "heavy" with the both tending toward "light". Both groups perceive public influence on course content (Appendix E, Table B) as "light" to "none". Licensing agency influence is consistently seen as "heavy" to "moderate", with an increase in the "none" response for courses offered and for course content.

The differences in perceived influence for the remaining groups are confirmed in the response patterns. TYCC faculty perceived somewhat less student influence on course content than MLAC faculty. Influence of college administration was perceived as "light" to "moderate" by the MLAC faculty but "moderate" to "heavy" by TYCC faculty on courses offered. Although both groups saw government influence as "light" or "none" most frequently for both courses offered and course content, TYCC faculty perceived "moderate" or "heavy" government influence more frequently than MLAC faculty. Both groups saw public influence on courses offered as "light" or "none" most frequently with TYCC faculty responding "moderate" or "heavy" more frequently. Employer influence on courses offered and course content was perceived to be "moderate" to "light" for MLAC faculty with the TYCC faculty response shifting toward "moderate" to "heavy". TYCC perceived professional organization influence on courses offered as "moderate" to "none" with "light" the most frequent response, where MLAC faculty responded "moderate" to "heavy". As for course content, TYCC saw influence of professional organizations fairly evenly distributed spread between "none" and "heavy", whereas MLAC responded "moderate" to "heavy".

Research Question 5: Is faculty perception of the influence of outside groups on the curriculum in higher education independent of selected faculty characteristics?

There are similarities and differences in the perception of the influence of various groups on courses offered and course content related to faculty characteristics. As in the study of institutional type, there were patterns of response that emerged when the response percentages were examined. Again, the faculty consistently perceived less influence of outside groups on course content than on courses offered. Patterns of percent response by faculty characteristic are summarized in the contingency tables in Appendix F.

Academic Discipline or Field

Responses from arts and science or professional/technical faculty were sorted according to their answer to questionnaire item 13. Liberal arts and sciences (LAS) faculty made up 46.6 percent ($n$ = 149) of the sample. Faculty from professional/technical (PT) fields constituted the remaining 53.4 percent ($n$ = 171).

Chi-square analysis was used to determine if the amount of influence on courses offered and course content was independent of academic discipline or field ($p < .05$). The results (Table 11) showed that faculty perception of the amount of student, employer, licensing agency, and professional organization influence on courses offered is not independent of discipline or field. Faculty perception of the amount of employer, licensing agency, and professional organization influence on course content is not independent of academic discipline or field. Differences in perception of influence are related to academic discipline or field.

Table 11

Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Outside Group Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Academic Discipline or Field.

| Group | n | $\chi^2$ | df |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Courses Offered | | |
| Students | 320 | 21.5* | 4 |
| College administration | 319 | 5.6 | 4 |
| Government | 318 | 2.3 | 4 |
| Public | 315 | 2.6 | 4 |
| Employers | 321 | 15.9* | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 318 | 20.6* | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 319 | 27.9* | 4 |
| | Course Content | | |
| Students | 317 | 8.0 | 4 |
| College administration | 321 | 6.8 | 4 |
| Government | 318 | 8.6 | 4 |
| Public | 321 | 8.4 | 4 |
| Employers | 320 | 28.9* | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 320 | 27.1* | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 319 | 24.6* | 4 |

Note. $n < 321$ is due to missing data.
*$p < .05$.

Although LAS and PT faculty responded similarly for three of the groups where the chi-square was not significant, the patterns of response varied from group to group. Administrative influence on courses offered (see Appendix F, Table A) was seen as "light" to "moderate". Government and public influence was seen as "none" to "light". The faculty perceived "moderate" to "light" influence for student and college administration influence on course content (Appendix F, Table B), but responded "light" or "none" for government and the public influence.

Differences in percent response patterns were as varied as the groups. LAS faculty perceived student influence on courses offered as fairly evenly distributed from "light", to "heavy" whereas PT faculty tended toward "moderate" to "none". LAS faculty perceived "moderate" to "light" influence of employers while PT faculty shifted toward "heavy" to "moderate". Almost twice as many of the PT faculty, 54.1 percent, perceived "heavy" or "total" licensing agency influence while almost twice as many LAS faculty, 30.4 percent, responded "none". The clearest shift was in the perceived influence of professional organizations. Over 57 percent of the LAS faculty responded "none" or "light" for courses offered, while 61.8 percent of the PT faculty perceived "heavy" to "moderate" influence.

The LAS faculty responded "moderate" to "none" at 87.1 percent for employer influence on course content where PT faculty saw "moderate" to "heavy" influence at 67.3 percent. In a pattern similar to courses offered, almost twice as many of the PT faculty, 42.1 percent, perceived "heavy" licensing agency influence on course content while almost twice as many LAS faculty, 32.9 percent, saw no influence. LAS faculty perceived professional organization influence on course content as "moderate" to "none"

while PT faculty perceived "moderate" to "heavy" influence.

Academic Rank

The majority of the faculty, 57.8 percent, held the rank of instructor. Assistant professors made up 15.9 percent of the sample. Associate professors and professors were split fairly evenly at 10.0 percent and 10.9 percent respectively. The remainder, 5.3 percent, responded "other".

Chi-square analysis was used to determine if the amount of influence on courses offered and course content was independent of academic rank ($p < .05$). The results (Table 12) showed that faculty perception of the amount of college administration and government influence on courses offered is not independent of rank. Faculty perception of the amount of college administration, government, and employer influence on course content is not independent of academic rank. Differences in faculty perceptions of influence, in these cases, are related to academic rank.

Similarities in percent response patterns show "light" or "moderate" influence on courses offered (Appendix F, Table C) except for licensing agencies where the shift is toward "moderate" to "heavy". "Light" to "moderate" is the trend for influence on course content (Appendix F, Table D). There is a shift toward "light" or no influence for the public and a shift toward "moderate" to "heavy" for licensing agency influence on course content.

Differences in percent response patterns for courses offered are seen in administrative influence and government influence. Instructors responded "light" to "heavy" for college administration while the remaining ranks tended to respond "light" or "moderate". The majority of the professors, 51.4 percent, responded "light". Instructor response to government influence was again broadly spread between "none" and "heavy"

Table 12

Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Outside Group Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Academic Rank.

| Group | n | $\chi^2$ | df |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Courses Offered | | |
| Students | 321 | 22.7 | 16 |
| College administration | 319 | 42.1* | 16 |
| Government | 318 | 36.7* | 16 |
| Public | 315 | 25.6 | 16 |
| Employers | 321 | 15.2 | 16 |
| Licensing agencies | 318 | 19.7 | 16 |
| Professional organizations | 319 | 23.5 | 16 |
| | Course Content | | |
| Students | 317 | 25.7 | 16 |
| College administration | 321 | 42.1* | 16 |
| Government | 318 | 29.9* | 12 |
| Public | 321 | 15.2 | 16 |
| Employers | 320 | 26.6* | 16 |
| Licensing agencies | 320 | 24.7 | 16 |
| Professional organizations | 319 | 16.6 | 16 |

Note. $n < 321$ is due to missing data.
*$p < .05$.

as was the response from assistant professors. Assistant professors, 75.0 percent, and professors, 77.1 percent, tended to respond "light" or "none" for government influence on courses offered.

Similarities in response patterns were seen in student, public, licensing agency, and professional organization influence on course content. Student influence was most frequently seen as "light" or "moderate". Public influence was perceived as "none" or "light" more than seventy percent of the time for all ranks. Licensing agency influence ranges from predominantly "none" for professors to predominantly "heavy" for assistant professors, with the remaining ranks widely spread. Faculty responses for professional organization influence is broadly spread between "none" and "light" with "moderate" the highest percentage of response for all ranks.

Differences in percent response patterns for course content are seen for college administration, government, and employer influence. The instructor's response was broadly spread between "none" and "heavy" for college administration and government influence with 45.9 responding "moderate". Assistant professor and associate professor response was spread between "none" and "moderate" for college administration and government influence with "none" or "light" being the most frequent responses. Professors responded "none" to "light" at 80.0 percent and 85.8 percent respectively for college administration and government influence on course content.

Tenure

Questionnaire item 11 asked the respondents ($n$ = 319) about tenure. About a third of the faculty 38.9 percent ($n$ = 125) responded "yes" and 23.4 percent ($n$ = 75) responded "no". Tenure was not available to 32.7 percent ($n$ = 105) of the faculty and 4.4 percent ($n$ = 14) were not in tenure track positions. For analysis purposes, the columns were collapsed into tenured ($n$ = 125) and non-tenured faculty ($n$ =194).

Chi-square was used to determine if the amount of influence on courses offered and course content was independent of tenure ($p < .05$). The results (Table 13) showed that faculty perception of the amount of college administration and government influence on courses offered is not independent of tenure. Faculty perception of the amount of student, college administration, and government, on course content is not independent of tenure. Differences in the faculty perception if influence, in these cases, is related to tenure.

Similarities in percent response patterns for courses (Appendix F, Table E) offered show "light" to "moderate" student influence and "light" to "moderate" public influence. Employers have "moderate" to "light" influence. Licensing agencies again show "heavy" to "moderate" influence, as do professional organizations. Of interest is a fairly large response in the "none" category for licensing agencies.

There were similarities in percent response for course content (Appendix F, Table F) in most of the groups. Faculty perceived "light" to "moderate" public influence. Employers have "moderate" to "light" influence. Licensing agencies have "heavy" influence on course content. Professional organization influence is split among "light" to "heavy" with "moderate" being the most frequent response.

Table 13

Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Tenure

| Group | n | $\chi^2$ | df |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Courses Offered | | |
| Students | 319 | 3.38 | 4 |
| College administration | 318 | 12.52* | 4 |
| Government | 317 | 17.77* | 4 |
| Public | 314 | 5.90 | 4 |
| Employers | 319 | 5.41 | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 317 | 6.94 | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 318 | 6.24 | 4 |
| | Course Content | | |
| Students | 316 | 11.83* | 4 |
| College administration | 319 | 9.51* | 4 |
| Government | 319 | 13.63* | 4 |
| Public | 319 | 7.11 | 4 |
| Employers | 319 | 5.38 | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 319 | 4.93 | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 318 | 6.88 | 4 |

Note. n < 321 is due to missing data.
p < .05.

As expected, differences in percent response patterns show that tenured faculty generally perceived less college administration and government influence on courses offered than non-tenured faculty. Tenured faculty perceived "light" to "moderate" administrative influence while non-tenured saw "moderate" to "heavy" influence. Tenured faculty response concentrated around "none" to "light" influence compared to a fairly broad response from "light" to "heavy" for non-tenured faculty.

Differences in percent response patterns for influence on course content are seen in student, college administration, and government influence. Both tenured and non-tenured faculty perceived "moderate" to "light" student influence. However, tenured faculty response centered on "moderate" while non-tenured response centered on "light". Tenured faculty perceived "light" to no administrative influence on course content while non-tenured faculty response tended toward "light" to "moderate". The tenured faculty perceived "none", most frequently, or "light" government influence while non-tenured faculty response was spread from "moderate" to "none", with "light" the most frequent response.

Race

An overwhelming number of the faculty sampled, 91.9 percent (n = 294) responded "white, non-Hispanic". African-Americans made up 4.4 percent (n = 14) of the sample. The remainder were Native American, 1.6 percent (n = 5), white-Hispanic, 1.3 percent (n = 4), and Asian American, 0.9 percent, (n = 3). Since there were so few of the faculty from under-represented populations in the sample, the columns were collapsed into white, non-Hispanic and minority for statistical analysis. Any conclusions drawn from this sample must be viewed in light of the preponderance of white, non-Hispanic faculty within the sample.

Chi-square analysis was used to determine if the amount of influence on courses offered and course content was independent of race ($p < .05$). The results (Table 14) showed that faculty perception of the amount of student, administrative, and public influence on courses offered was not independent of race. Faculty perception of influence on course content was independent of race in every group except college administration.

Similarities in perception of influence on courses offered (Appendix F, Table G) showed "light" or no government influence, "moderate" to "heavy" employer influence, "heavy" to "moderate" licensing agency influence, and "moderate" to "light" professional organization influence. Similarities in course content (Appendix F, Table G) showed "moderate" to "light" student influence, "light" to no government influence, "light" to no public influence, "heavy" to "moderate" licensing agency influence, and "moderate" to "heavy" professional organization influence.

Again, there is a fairly large "none" response for licensing agencies.

Table 14

Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Race.

| Group | n | $\chi^2$ | df |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Courses Offered | | |
| Students | 320 | 21.71* | 4 |
| College administration | 319 | 18.78* | 4 |
| Government | 318 | 9.46* | 4 |
| Public | 315 | 10.53* | 4 |
| Employers | 320 | 2.38 | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 318 | 0.29 | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 319 | 6.22 | 4 |
| | Course Content | | |
| Students | 317 | 6.59 | 4 |
| College administration | 320 | 16.21* | 4 |
| Government | 318 | 6.35 | 4 |
| Public | 320 | 5.70 | 4 |
| Employers | 320 | 3.57 | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 320 | 4.44 | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 3.19 | 7.66 | 4 |

Note. n < 321 is due to missing data.
p < .05.

Dissimilarities were seen in the faculty perception of student, college administration, and public influence on courses offered and administration influence on course content. Faculty perception of student and public influence on courses offered showed that minorities perceived "moderate" to "heavy" influence while white, non-Hispanics saw "moderate" to "light" influence. College administration influence was perceived as "moderate" to "heavy" for minorities verses "moderate" to "light" for white, non-Hispanics.

Gender

The sample was 60.3 percent (n = 191) female and 39.7 percent (n = 126) male. Chi-square analysis was used to determine if the amount of influence on courses offered and course content was independent of gender ($p < .05$). The results (Table 15) showed that faculty perception of licensing agency and professional organization influence on courses offered is not independent of gender. Faculty perception of licensing agency influence on course content is not independent of gender.

"Moderate" to "light" or no influence was the rule for similarities in percent response patterns for courses offered and course content. There was a tendency for both males and females to respond "moderate" to student influence on courses offered Appendix F, Table I). There was a tendency to perceive professional organization influence on course content as "heavy" to "moderate" for both females and males (Appendix F, Table J).

Differences were seen in licensing agency influence and professional organization influence on courses offered. Both groups perceived "heavy" to "moderate" licensing agency with females tending toward the "heavy" response. The jump in the response to "none" was almost twice as frequent in males as females. Female perception of professional organization influence was split fairly evenly from "heavy", the highest response, to "none". Males, on the other hand, perceived "moderate" to "light" influence on courses offered.

Table 15

Summary of Chi-square for Amount of Influence on Courses Offered and Course Content by Gender.

| Group | n | $\chi^2$ | df |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Courses Offered | | |
| Students | 317 | 3.99 | 4 |
| College administration | 316 | 0.45 | 4 |
| Government | 315 | 8.15 | 4 |
| Public | 313 | 2.90 | 4 |
| Employers | 317 | 2.51 | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 315 | 19.06* | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 316 | 14.34* | 4 |
| | Course Content | | |
| Students | 314 | 2.42 | 4 |
| College administration | 317 | 1.25 | 4 |
| Government | 315 | 6.79 | 4 |
| Public | 317 | 5.58 | 4 |
| Employers | 317 | 6.77 | 4 |
| Licensing agencies | 317 | 16.6* | 4 |
| Professional organizations | 317 | 2.89 | 4 |

Note. n < 321 is due to missing data.
*p < .05.

Age and Years in Higher Education

Items 14 and 15 asked the respondents how many years they had been in higher education and their age. The mean number of years in higher education was 14.0 years (sd = 8.9 years) with a minimum of 1 year and a maximum of 51 years. The mean age for the respondents was 46.0 years (sd = 9.1) with a minimum of 26 years and a maximum of 75 years.

Regression was used to see if there was a relationship between number of years in higher education or age and the perceived influence of the outside groups studied. Regression of number of years in higher education on perceived influence showed no significance for any of the groups studied ($p < .01$) with R for all groups less than 0.10. Regression of age on perceived influence of the groups studied showed no significance in any of the groups ($p < .01$) with R for all groups, except administration, less than 0.10. Multiple R for administrative influence on courses offered and course content were 0.16 and 0.12 respectively.

Although regression was not found to be significant, there is the possibility that there is some relationship that is not linear, perhaps curvilinear. In this case, regression would not be significant even though relationship may exist. On closer examination of the data, it appears there is that possibility due to a disproportionate distribution in age and years in higher education. Specifically, 58.9 percent of the sample were age 36 to 55, with 33.2 percent between the ages of 36 and 45 years, and 25.7 percent between 46 and 55 years of age. Faculty from 26 to 35 years of age accounted for only 12.7 percent of the sample, with only 13.6 percent from age 56 to 65, and 2.2% from age 65 to 75. Since there is clearly a disproportionately large number of faculty from age 35 to 55 it would

make a linear relationship due to age difficult to see when there is very little difference in age.

There is a disproportionate distribution for years in higher education that is similar to the distribution seen in age. The largest majority of faculty, 70.7 percent, have between 6 and 25 years in higher education, with 44.1 percent at 6 to 15 years and 26.6 percent at 16 to 25 years. As for the extremes, there are 18.4 percent of the faculty with 5 or years or less in higher education, 8.7 percent with 26 to 35 years, and 1.9% with 36 or more years. Again, with the disproportionate distribution a linear relationship due to age would be difficult to see.

## Summary of Results

The overwhelming majority of the faculty perceived that they have "heavy" or "total" control of the courses taught and course content. This finding is consistent across institutional type and the faculty characteristics studied. Private college faculty more frequently perceived "heavy" or "total" influence than their public college counterparts. Liberal arts and sciences, tenured, male, and minority faculty perceived "heavy" or "total" influence more frequently than professional/technical, non-tenured, female, white, non-Hispanic faculty. There was a tendency toward more "heavy" or "total" faculty influence over course content than courses offered.

Faculty perceived consistently "moderate" to "light" influence of outside groups on courses offered and course content. Faculty perceived "moderate" to "heavy" influence from licensing agencies and professional organizations. This finding persisted for the majority of the faculty characteristics studied.

The possibility of questionable responses to the paired items on the survey makes

an association of the amount of influence with discrete levels of influence difficult to make. However, it is reasonably clear that the faculty in general can judge what levels of influence are "about right" and what are not. The contingency tables show very few responses in the "heavy" or "total" alternatives that are perceived as "about right". The level of perceived influence is probably related to the amount of perceived influence but cannot be confidently viewed as statistically significant due to the validity problems associated with the paired items. The faculty studied in this sample indicate that "moderate" to "none" are levels of outside group influence that are "about right". Higher levels of influence are not "about right".

Faculty perception of influence on courses offered and course content by outside groups is clearly not independent of institutional type for all of the groups studied. Although they agree on the "heavy" influence licensing agencies and the "light" public and student influence, they tend to answer differently on other groups. Public, two-year college faculty perceived a higher level of influence of outside groups more frequently than their private, liberal arts counterparts and are more likely to perceive that level as "about right".

Faculty perception of influence of outside groups on the curriculum is independent of the faculty characteristics studied in all but about a third of the comparisons. The faculty generally perceived a "light" amount of public influence. "Light" student influence is perceived for course content but not for courses offered. There was substantial agreement in the "moderate" to "heavy" amount of perceived professional organization and licensing agency influence. Although faculty saw "moderate" or "heavy" licensing agency influence most frequently there was a consistent

bimodal distribution centering on "none" and "moderate" or "heavy".

Differences in faculty perceptions of influence on the curriculum are found in administration, government, and employers. The professional/technical faculty, minority faculty and non-tenured faculty see a heavier amount of employer, government, and administrative influence than their tenured, liberal arts and sciences counterparts from the majority demographic. There was an increase in faculty perception of their own influence and a decrease in the influence of others as the level of academic rank increased. Faculty perception of outside influence on the curriculum was not related to age or number of years in higher education.

## Chapter 5

## Discussion

This chapter summarizes the purpose of the study and the methodology used. The findings of the study are discussed in light of the research questions and the literature. The discussion is followed by implications for governance over the curriculum, recommendations for further research, and conclusions.

### Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine faculty perception of their own influence on the curriculum in higher education and the influence of other groups. Institutions from different classifications of the Carnegie Typology were used to determine if there were differences in perception of influence on curriculum due to institutional type. Certain faculty characteristics were selected out to determine if faculty perception of influence on the curriculum was related to any of the characteristics studied. Courses offered and course content were used as indicators of influence for the larger idea of curriculum.

A questionnaire was distributed to the faculty (n = 489) at four different institutions in two geographical regions of the United States to gather data about faculty perceptions of influence on the curriculum. The response rate of valid questionnaires, 65.6 percent (n = 321), was judged to be suitable for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to show trends. Chi-square was used to test for independence of

influence from institutional type and faculty traits. Contingency tables were examined for similarities and differences in patterns of response.

## Discussion

This study revealed a strong sense of faculty influence over the curriculum in higher education. Beyond what the empirical data suggest about overall trends and differences in the characteristic sub-groups is the idea that, despite the reality of significant transgressions of outsiders (Duryea, 1987; McConnell, 1987), the faculty studied persist in perceiving that they are the keepers of the curriculum in higher education. This confirms the first scenario described in Chapter 1 where the faculty perception of their own influence is "heavy" and where any reduction in their influence would be seen as not right and result in conflict. Faculty who perceive "heavy" or "total" authority over what they teach may risk conflict with external constituencies who believe that, or in fact do, have a stake in the what is taught and how it is taught.

It appears as though the faculty studied declare that, at least in some sense, they perceive the "ivory tower" to be intact, despite the historical and contemporary evidence to the contrary (Carnochan, 1993; Rudolph, 1990). Given that American institutions of higher education are so closely tied to the larger society (McConnell, 1987), it is difficult to think that the idea of faculty autonomy on the curriculum is still so broadly held and deeply entrenched. The author also wonders how so many of the faculty could be so detached in a culture of higher education that is, and always has been, so profoundly beholden to so many constituencies. (Domonkos, 1989; Levine, 1978).

Particularly striking is the perceived low amount of government influence. The federal government has played a role in higher education since early in the nineteenth

century (Rudolph, 1990; Stark, 1989). Today it is involved in everything from finance to accreditation (Rudolph, 1990; Gladeiux and King, 1999). State governments bear the bulk of the cost of higher education and set assessment standards (Gladieux and King, 1999; McConnell , 1987; McGuinness, 1999). Local governments have significant influence, particularly in the local community college (Cohen and Brower, 1989; Levine, 1989). Perhaps, since government influence has always been a part of higher education, faculty have become desensitized to its presence and influence.

On the other hand, the perception of a strong sense of faculty autonomy is a very real, quite essential strength of the faculty and the academic institution. Although this perceived autonomy can be a source of troublesome conflicts, it is the idea of faculty autonomy that allows for consideration of new and different directions for teaching and learning that may, and often should, depart from the prescribed canon of the indigenous culture. It is this strongly held notion of faculty autonomy, and the resultant freedom to teach and freedom to learn, that is characteristic of an institution of higher education (Barnett, 1992). It is the strength of this perception that ultimately identifies the faculty not just as vendors of information, but as a community of scholars.

The tendency for faculty to perceive that they have less influence over what courses are taught than content is consistent with the rise of the elective curriculum, the increased influence of outside agencies, and issues of race, gender, and class (Altbach, 1999; Anderson, 1987; Banks, 1993, Eaton, 1991; Rudolph, 1990). The presentation of and material in these courses is still perceived as a matter of faculty judgement. It follows that faculty are likely to tolerate mandates for courses but not as likely to tolerate intrusions into the classroom

Faculty perception of some amount of influence on the curriculum from outside groups is to be expected since higher education in America is, and has always been, closely tied to society. Demands for accountability in higher education and increasing professional specialization due to an expanding knowledge base may contribute to that perception as well (Cambridge, 1999, Harcleroad, 1999; Stark, 1986).

What is particularly interesting about the faculty perception is that faculty could see their influence as "heavy" to "total" while perceiving a "moderate" amount of influence from other groups. One might expect that if faculty most frequently saw their influence as "heavy" or total, then the corresponding influence for the other groups would be a more complementary "light" or "none". Since this is not the case then the faculty do not seem to perceive influence on the curriculum as a "zero sum" proposition.

The acceptance of a "moderate" amount of influence over the curriculum stands to reason. A community of scholars, by its very nature, should be open to the ideas and opinions of others, from within or without the institution, whether or not they agree with their point of view. After all, reasonable people can reason together. However, there is a point beyond which a higher amount of influence is not "about right". Pushing beyond that point intrudes on faculty autonomy and invites conflict over the curriculum. This study shows that "moderate" to no influence from outside of the faculty is perceived as reasonable.

That the faculty from the two types of institutions surveyed view influence from outside groups differently for a number of the groups studied is expected and is consistent with the decidedly different missions due to institutional type. Community colleges are, by design, responsive to the changing educational needs of students entering higher

education and the professional/technical workforce needs of the communities that they serve (Cohen and Brower, 1989; McConnell, 1987). As such, it is not surprising that faculty should perceive a significant level of outside group influence and concomitant decrease in their own influence on the curriculum. Given a more community-focussed mission, they are likely to be more tolerant of outside influence than their liberal arts or private college counterparts.

By contrast, private, liberal arts institutions answer to their boards of trustees and carry out a more broadly-based, generalist educational mission (Lazerson, 1997). They are not as accountable to licensing agencies, professional organizations, and other communities of interest as their professional/technical counterparts within their institutions or among their community college counterparts. Since they are not as accountable to these agencies, they are not likely to perceive the influence of outside groups on the curriculum or even acknowledge the importance of the influence perceived by the professional/technical faculty. However, those differences in perceptions can lead to unnecessary conflict over matters of curriculum within institutions and/or between institutions, particularly when external groups impose changes or requirements.

Although there was considerable agreement for faculty perception of the influence of outside groups on the curriculum, there were differences due to faculty characteristics in about a third of the comparisons. Differences due to academic discipline or field are not surprising and may be a continuation of the historical struggle between the liberal arts and the professions (Kimball, 1988; Sloan, 1971; Veysey, 1973). It may also be related to the close ties that professional programs have with the professional organizations that sponsor accreditation agencies (Harcleroad, 1999; Stark, 1986) which often make

recommendations about courses, and licensing agencies, which may dictate course content. Likewise, employers are more likely to be tied to the professional/technical faculty who educate the graduates that they hire.

The faculty rank characteristic plays a role in the perception of influence on the curriculum in American higher education. That instructors see a heavier amount of influence of outside groups is not surprising since they are more likely to be new to higher education and not sure about what they should teach or who, if anyone, should tell them. However, instructors in the sample are likely to be professional/technical faculty found in the community college where outside influence is expected. Therefore, care must be taken to keep from concluding that differences in perception may be due entirely to rank when academic discipline or institutional type may confound findings.

The perception of increased faculty influence on the curriculum as rank is higher is expected as is the concomitant perception of a decrease in outside influence. With increasing experience, academic degrees, and scholarship comes faculty promotion in rank and an increase in confidence. Faculty would be expected, as is seen in this study, to have more of a sense of their own influence over the curriculum and less interference of others as they rise in rank. Likewise, faculty would be expected to perceive the highest level of their own influence over curriculum and the lowest level of outside groups, as the data suggest, when they reach the rank of professor. They are also likely to be tenured which, in this study, is associated with a higher amount of perceived faculty influence and a lower amount of outside group influence.

It is interesting to note that there is no apparent difference in perception of influence due to gender with the exceptions of the licensing agency and professional

organization groups. Since men reason from a justice perspective and women reason from a caring perspective (Maher, 1995) then differences in perceptions due to gender might be expected. The different perceptions in licensing agency and professional organization influence may be the result of the preponderance of women in the health care professions, where outside influence is a fact of professional life, rather than differences in gender alone.

As noted earlier, some of the differences found in perceptions of influence may be due to potentially confounding factors in the sample that the Chi-squared statistic cannot take into account. Specifically, differences due to institutional type may be due to the large number of professional and technical faculty in the community colleges that are not present in the private colleges. In the same way differences in perception due to discipline may be affected by gender because of the predominantly female caring professions. Difference in perceptions attributed to rank may be affected by institutional type or discipline because of the preponderance of instructors in the sample that are from community colleges which do not typically offer rank beyond the level of instructor.

The bimodal response to the influence of licensing agencies is unique among all of the groups and it is interesting to speculate about the cause. This finding may be caused by distinct faculty characteristics that are related in some way to licensing agencies and would result in polar points of view. For example, liberal arts and sciences faculty may perceive no licensing agency influence while professional faculty, particularly in the health sciences, may perceive "heavy" influence resulting in a split in opinion and distribution of responses. Perhaps some of the faculty from the liberal arts, who perceive a lower level of outside group influence in general, selected licensing

agencies in lieu of accrediting agencies which would also cause a split in the distribution of responses.

## Conclusions

This study indicates that faculty perceive that they have "heavy" to "total" influence on what courses are taught and even more influence on the content of their courses. This finding is seen consistently regardless of institutional type or faculty characteristic. Faculty perceived more influence of outside groups on courses offered than on course content. Judging from these indicators, faculty perceive that they are still, by far, the most significant influence on curriculum. It is clear that idea of faculty autonomy over curriculum in higher education is largely intact.

A faculty perception of slightly less influence on what courses are taught is to be expected. Faculty are likely to have a good deal of influence on what goes on in the classroom. However, who comes to class depends on a number of factors including student preference, government mandates through academic standards and funding, licensing or professional organization requirements for content in the discipline, and pressure from groups inside or outside of the university.

The liberal arts and sciences faculty do not perceive outside influence on the curriculum as heavily or as frequently as their colleagues in the professions. This suggests a higher level of detachment of liberal arts and sciences faculty from external constituencies that is very different than professional and technical faculty. Likewise, this detachment is contrary to the historically societal context of American higher education. This level of detachment confirms the suspicions of the author and helps to frame the nature of the struggles over the curriculum that professional and technical programs face

now and are likely to face in the future. As a result, these programs will continue to be caught in the middle of conflicts over the curriculum due to pressures from without, by way of accrediting, licensing, and professional agencies, and pressures from within, by way of the struggle to preserve the liberal arts and sciences in the curriculum.

Despite the perceived intrusion of groups outside the faculty into the curriculum in higher education, there continues to be a strong sense of faculty influence on the curriculum. There are, however, boundaries of light to "moderate" influence that the, if ignored, will be perceived by the faculty as "not right". Transgressions beyond these boundaries are likely to be perceived as an infringement on faculty autonomy and may result in conflict. Although this is a study of the perceptions of a limited sample from only two institutional types, perception is often reality.

In general faculty perceptions of the influence of outside groups on the curriculum is similar for the majority of characteristics tested. However, there are differences in perceptions of the influence of some of the outside groups that are associated with certain faculty characteristics. This is particularly true for the professional/technical faculty who perceive a heavier influence of professional organizations, licensing agencies, and employers.

Educational leaders and policy-makers can use the findings of this study to anticipate faculty responses to increases in influence of groups outside of the faculty on the curriculum in higher education. In doing so, policy-makers can develop policies with an eye toward avoiding, whenever possible, areas of influence on the curriculum perceived to be the purview of the faculty. Developing academic policy with the level of influence in mind may result in fewer conflicts over the curriculum in higher education

that may rise out of challenges to the idea of faculty autonomy. The result will be less time and energy spent on resolution of conflicts over the curriculum and more focus on pedagogy.

## Implications for Governance and the Curriculum

Faculty perceive "heavy" influence over the curriculum and are likely to hold on to that sense of ownership that started with the establishment of the early communities of scholars and persists to this day. College administrators and external policy makers would be wise to keep this in mind when considering changes in the curriculum and be prepared to address the concerns of the owners if challenged with a loss of what they perceive is theirs. Wise administrators would treat any decrease of faculty influence on the curriculum in the same manner as they would the loss of anything valuable at the workplace, and prepare accordingly.

Since faculty recognize "moderate" to no outside influence on the curriculum and perceive it as about the right level of influence then administrators and policy-makers should proceed with moderate changes over time rather than abrupt, sweeping changes that may provoke conflict. This study shows that faculty in general will tolerate a "light" to "moderate" amount of influence. As such, proposed changes in curriculum initiated outside of the faculty are likely to be accepted if the increments of change are in keeping with the "light" to "moderate" amounts of influence that the faculty will tolerate.

Administrators and faculty alike should recognize the differences in the amounts that faculty perceive, and are comfortable with, and the constraints that external agencies, for better or worse, place on academic programs and their faculty. Liberal arts faculty need to be aware of the fact of external influence on professional programs and work

more closely with professional program faculty to address curricular needs. Professional faculty need to be cognizant of the role of the liberal arts in educating the student and the commitment of the liberal arts faculty to that goal. The college administrator should play the role of mediator to see that the curricular process continues while balancing the needs of the varied constituencies in higher education.

## Recommendations for Further Study

Recommendations for further study on faculty perceptions of influence on the curriculum in higher education are grounded in technical considerations and the findings of this study. The technical considerations are addressed first. These are followed by recommendations that arise out of the results of the study.

### Recommendation 1: Refine the questionnaire.

The items in the questionnaire should be refined to make the stems of the paired items related to each other but more distinct to the reader. As has been discussed earlier, there is some question as to whether the respondents to the questionnaire could detect the difference between "how much" and "level" in stems of the paired items. Clarification of the stems may be accomplished could be done by replacing "level" in the stem with "appropriate level" in questions two and four. This descriptor for "level" would prompt for a more qualitative answer.

The stems of items two and four could be preserved and the alternatives changed to make the alternatives more distinctive. The alternatives could be changed to reflect a more qualitative answer than the somewhat quantitative answers asked for in the paired items that precede them. The current alternative "about right" could remain or be replaced by "appropriate" as either would ask asks for a qualitative judgement. "Too

high" should replace the high end of the perception of level of influence and "too low" should replace the low end of the Likert scale. Keeping the scale from one to five but removing the descriptors for two and four would allow the respondent to select a level between "too high" or "too low" and the middle alternatives, "about right" or "appropriate". A pilot study should be done with the revised questionnaire to improve validity.

Recommendation 2: Repeat the study in a broader sample of typologies.

It would be interesting to see if repeating the study at other institutions of differing typologies would yield different results. For example, Research I and II institutions have distinctly different missions, particularly with respect to research, than the institutions in this study. It would be interesting to see if the similarities and differences found in this study are repeated across the typologies. Of particular interest, and utility to these types of institutions as well as policy makers that have authority over a broad range of institutional types, would be to see if the perceptions of the faculty with similar characteristics are similar across the extremes of the typologies. Findings may then begin to show if universally accepted ideas related to faculty autonomy are true for all post-secondary institutions or are different for each type. If perceptions are similar across institutional types then perhaps policies related to the faculty and curriculum could be similar. However, if perceptions are different, then perhaps policies should be different as well.

Recommendation 3: Repeat the study and include accrediting agencies.

Since accreditation is significant piece in the influence of outside groups, particularly in the professional and technical fields the faculty perception of these

agencies should be taken into account. This distinction on the questionnaire may eliminate the confusing bimodal distribution of responses seen in licensing agencies and possibly confirm or refute the causes postulated earlier for that distribution by separating responses out of the licensing agency items.

Recommendation 4: Survey the external agencies, particularly government groups, to examine their perceptions amount and appropriate level of influence on the curriculum.

To complete the picture of perceived faculty influence on the curriculum in higher education, the groups outside the faculty could be surveyed to determine their perceptions of the their own influence and the influence of others. Surveying the outside groups would allow for comparison of differences between them and among the faculty groups. Results of the surveys of policy-makers, college administrators, legislators, influential public boards and organizations, and employers would provide all involved with a better understanding of the different perspectives of the groups involved in decision-making. Given a better understanding of the perspectives of these groups by the participants in higher education, there would be more opportunity for better communication, a more constructive curricular process, a more effective process for developing governance policies, and the possibility of less conflict.

Recommendation 5: Use the questionnaire to begin developing an instrument that could determine if perceptions of influence of potential faculty and administrators are consistent with the mission, culture, and characteristics of the institution.

It would seem useful to have an instrument that would help determine a candidate's self-reported perceptions of how groups that they may associate with influence the curriculum. If a candidate's perception of how internal and external groups

influence the curriculum differs significantly from the reality of the institution then the fit with that institution may not be desirable. The result of a poor fit may be unwanted and unnecessary conflict in areas of governance over curriculum. Specifically, the administrator that perceives that faculty should have little influence over the curriculum, or curriculum should be the responsibility of others, is likely to have difficulty in working with the faculty that is used to have a significant role in determining the curriculum. In the same way, a faculty member that is used to considerable autonomy with respect to the curriculum and significant governance over same is likely to be very frustrated, and less productive, in an institution where the or an outside board tightly controls or substantially determines the curriculum.

## References


Altbach, P. G. (1985). The great education "crisis." In P. G. Altbach, (Ed.), Excellence in Education: Perspectives on Policy and Practice (pp. 13-30). Buffalo: Prometheus Books.

American Association of Colleges (1990). The decline and devaluation of the undergraduate degree. In C. F. Conrad & J. G. Haworth (Eds.), Curriculum in transition: perspectives on the undergraduate experience, (pp. 65-94). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press

American Association of University Professors (1991). Statement on government of colleges and universities. In M. W. Peterson (Ed.), Organization and governance in higher education (4th. ed., pp. 157-163). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Andersen, M. (1987). Curriculum change in higher education. Signs: Journal of Women and Culture in Society, 12 (4), 222-54.

Banks, J. A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. The Educational Researcher, 22(2), 44-55.

Barnett. R. (1990). The idea of higher education. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Berdahl, R. O., and Altbach, P. G. (1987). Higher education in American society: an introduction. In P. G. Altbach, and R. O. Berdahl, (Eds.), Higher education in American society (Rev. ed., pp. 7-14). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1999). The dilemma of presidential leadership. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport, P. J (Eds.), American higher education in the twenty-first century: social, political and economic changes. (pp. 323-344). Baltimore: Johns

Hopkins Press.

Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Boyer, E. L. (1985). Reflections on the great debate. In P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, & L. Weis (Eds.), Excellence in education: perspectives on policy and practice (pp. 43-56). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). Higher education in transition. New York: Harper & Row.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1993). Governance in higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Carnochan, W. B. (1993). The battleground of the curriculum: liberal education and the American experience. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cohen, M. A., & Brawer, F. B. (1989). The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conrad, C. F., & Pratt, A. M. (1983). Making decisions about curriculum. Journal of Higher Education, 54(1), 16-30.

Domonkos, L. S. (1989). History of higher education. In L. F. Goodchild & H. F. Weschler (Eds.), History of higher education, (pp. 1-22). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Duryea, E. D. (1991). Evolution of university organization. In M. W. Peterson, (Ed.), ASHE Reader on Organization and governance in higher education (4th ed., pp. 6-16). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Duryea, E. D. (1987). The university and the state: A historical overview. In P. G.

Hopkins Press.

Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Boyer, E. L. (1985). Reflections on the great debate. In P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, & L. Weis (Eds.), Excellence in education: perspectives on policy and practice (pp. 43-56), Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). Higher education in transition. New York: Harper & Row.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1993). Governance in higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Carnochan, W. B. (1993). The battleground of the curriculum: liberal education and the American experience. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cohen, M. A., & Brawer, F. B. (1989). The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conrad, C. F., & Pratt, A. M. (1983). Making decisions about curriculum. Journal of Higher Education, 54(1), 16-30.

Domonkos, L. S. (1989). History of higher education. In L. F. Goodchild & H. F. Weschler (Eds.), History of higher education, (pp. 1-22). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Duryea, E. D. (1991). Evolution of university organization. In M. W. Peterson, (Ed.), ASHE Reader on Organization and governance in higher education (4th ed., pp. 6-16). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Duryea, E. D. (1987). The university and the state: A historical overview. In P. G.

Altbach and R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), Higher education in American society (Rev. ed., pp. 17-37). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Press.

Eaton, J. S. (1991). Academic reform: Compelling conversations of the 1980s. In American Council on Education. The unfinished agenda: Higher education and the 1980s. New York: MacMillan Press, Inc.

Gardner, D. E. (1977). Five evaluation frameworks: Implications for decision making in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 48, 571-593.

Gardner, S. (1989). Responding to differences in the classroom: The politics of knowledge, class, and sexuality. Sociology of Education, 62(1), 24-32

Geiger, R. (1999). Ten generations of higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), American higher education in the twenty-first century: social, political and economic changes (pp. 38 – 69). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Gladieux, L. E., & King, J. E. (1989). Federal government in higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport, (Eds.), American higher education in the twenty-first century: social, political and economic changes (pp. 38 – 69). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Harvard's report on the 'Core Curriculum'. (1978). Chronicle of Higher Education, 16, 15-19.

Harcleroad, F. F. (1999). The hidden hand: External constituencies and their impact. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.). American Higher education in the twenty-first century: social, political and economic changes (pp. 241-268). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Johnson, E. L. (1989). Misconceptions about early land-grant colleges. In L. F.

Goodchild, & H. F. Weschler (Eds.) History of higher education, (pp. 1-22). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Kerr, C. (1994). Forward: American society turns more assertive: A new century in approaches for higher education in the United States. In P. G. Altbach, et al. (Eds.), Higher education in American society (3rd ed.). Amherst, NY: Prometheus books.

Kimball, B. A. (1988). The historical and cultural dimensions of the recent reports on undergraduate education. American Journal of Education, 98, 293-322.

Lazerson, M. (1997). Who owns higher education? The changing face of governance. Change, 29, (2)10-16

Levine, A. (1978). Handbook on the undergraduate curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, D. O. (1989). Junior college and the differentiation of the public sector. In L. F. Goodchild & H. F. Weschler (Eds.), History of higher education, (pp. 401-424). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Maher, F. (1995). Classroom pedagogy and the new scholarship on women. In J. G. Haworth and C. F. Conrad (Eds.), Revisioning curriculum in higher education (pp. 316-327). Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster

McIntosh, P. M. (1989). Curricular re-visioning: The knowledge for a new age. In C. S. Pearson, D. L. Shavlik & J. G. Touchton (Eds.), Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education. New York. MacMillan.

McConnell, T. R. (1987). Autonomy and accountability: Some fundamental issues. In P. G. Altbach & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), Higher education in American society (Rev. ed., pp. 39-58). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

McGuinness, A. C. (1999). The states and higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, and P. J. Gumport, (Eds.), American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political and economic changes (pp. 183 – 215). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Metzger, W. P. (1987). Academic freedom in delocalized academic institutions. In P. G. Altbach & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), Higher education in American society (Rev. ed., pp. 39-58). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Peters, R. (1994). Some snarks are boojums: Accountability and the ends of higher education. Change, 26, (6) 16-23.

Peterson, P. E. (1985). Did the education commissions say anything? In P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, & L. Weis (Eds.), Excellence in education: Perspectives on policy and practice (pp. 57-74). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Robles, H.J. (1998) Reform in American higher education. ED426746. U.S. Department of Education.

Rudolph, F. (1977). Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rudolph, F. (1990). The American college and university: A history. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Searle, J. (1990, December 6). The storm over the university. New York Review of Books, 34-42.

Sloan, D. (1971). Harmony, chaos, and consensus: The American college curriculum. Teacher's College Record, 73, 221-251.

Stark. J. S. & Lattuca, L. (1996). Shaping the college curriculum: Academic

plans in action. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Stark, J. S. & Lowther, M. A. (1989). Exploring common ground in liberal and professional education: Integrating liberal learning and professional education. In R. A. Armour & B. S. Fuhrman (Eds.), New Directions for Teaching and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stark, J. S., Lowther, M. A., and Hagherty, B. A. (1986). Responsive Professional Education: Balancing Outcomes and Opportunities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (3). Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education

Thelin, J. R. (1994). Campus and commonwealth: A historical interpretation. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), Higher education in American society (3rd ed., pp. 21-36). Amherst, MA: Prometheus Books.

Toombs, W. E. & Tierney, W. G. (1993). Curriculum definitions and reference points. Journal of Curriculum Revision, 8(3), 175-195.

Trow, M. A. (1991) Comparative reflections on leadership in higher education. In L. F. Goodchild, and H. F. Weschler (Eds.), History of Higher Education, (pp. 335-368). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

U.S. Department of Education (1999). Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Veysey, L. R. (1973). Stability and experiment in the American undergraduate classroom. In C. Kaysen (Ed.), Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Weick, K. C. (1991). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. In M. W. Peterson (Ed.). Organization and Governance in Higher Education (4th ed., pp.103-

118). Needham Heights: Ginn Press

Weiler, K. (1991). Freire and a feminist pedagogy of difference. Harvard Education Review, 61(4), 449-474.

Wilson, J. K. (1999). The canon and the curriculum. In P. G. Altbach, & R.O. Berdahl, (Eds.), Higher education in American society (3rd ed., pp. 427-447). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Zimbler, L. J. (1993). Faculty and instruction staff: Who are they and what do they do?, Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, NCES 94-346.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

## Faculty Questionnaire on Influence on the Curriculum

NOTE: Questions one and two refer to influence on **individual courses**.

1. How much influence do each of the following groups have on decisions about what **courses** will be offered by your department? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

| | | none | light | moderate | heavy | total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. | college administration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. | local, state or federal government | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. | the public | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. | employers of graduates | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. | licensing agencies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. | professional organizations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2. Given your response to question number one, how would you describe the **level** of influence of each group? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

| | | very low | low | about right | high | very high |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | the students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. | college administration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. | local, state, or federal government | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. | the public | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. | employers of graduates | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. | licensing agencies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. | professional organizations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

NOTE: Questions three and four refer to influence on **content** within individual courses.

3. How much influence do each of the following groups have decisions about **course content** in your department? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

| | | none | light | moderate | heavy | total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. | college administration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. | local, state or federal government | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. | the public | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. | employers of graduates | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. | licensing agencies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. | professional organizations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

4. Given your response to question number three, how would you describe the **level** of influence of each group? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

| | | very low | low | about right | high | very high |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | the students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. | college administration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. | local, state, or federal government | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. | the public | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. | employers of graduates | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. | licensing agencies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. | professional organizations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

5. How much influence do you have on course content and methods in the courses you teach? (CIRCLE ONE)

a. none b. light c. moderate d. heavy e. total

6. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the authority you have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses you teach? (CIRCLE ONE)

a. very dissatisfied b. somewhat dissatisfied c. somewhat satisfied d. very satisfied

7. How much influence do you have on what courses you teach? (CIRCLE ONE)

a. none b. light c. moderate d. heavy e. total

8. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the authority you have to make decisions about what courses you teach? (CIRCLE ONE)

a. very dissatisfied b. somewhat dissatisfied c. somewhat satisfied d. very satisfied

**Please complete the following demographic items.**

9. Race (CIRCLE ONE)
a. White, non-Hispanic b. White, Hispanic c. African American d. Native American e. Asian American

10. Sex (CIRCLE ONE) a. male b. female

11. Are you tenured? (CIRCLE ONE)
a. yes b. no c. tenure is not available d. not in tenure track position

12. Academic rank? (CIRCLE ONE)
a. instructor b. assistant professor c. associate professor d. professor
other (please specify) _____

13. Academic discipline or field? (be specific)

14. Number of years, in teaching or research, in higher education? _____

15. Age? _____

Thank-you for participating in this survey.
Please turn to the front page, fold in half, and return by September 11 to:

Please fold with this side out and return to:

## Appendix B

## Correlation Coefficient Tables for Amount of Faculty Influence by Level of Influence

Table A

Correlation Coefficients for Courses offered Content

| Level of Influence | Amount of Influence: Student | College Admin. | Govern-ment | Public | Employers | Licensing Agencies | Profess. Organiz. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | .6656 | .0641 | -.0731 | .2624 | .1832 | -.0414 | -.0204 |
| | .000 | .253 | .193 | .000 | .001 | .461 | .716 |
| College Admin. | .2441 | .6848 | .1697 | .1328 | .0706 | -.0907 | -.2275 |
| | .000 | .000 | .002 | .018 | .208 | .107 | .000 |
| Govt. | -.0159 | .1541 | .6720 | .1322 | .0881 | .2359 | -.0289 |
| | .778 | .006 | .000 | .019 | .118 | .000 | .608 |
| Public | .3037 | -.0273 | .1065 | .5740 | .3717 | .1218 | .0715 |
| | .000 | .628 | .059 | .000 | .000 | .030 | .204 |
| Employer | .1781 | -.0100 | .1193 | .3424 | .6873 | .2106 | .2430 |
| | .001 | .859 | .033 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| Licensing Agencies | -.1159 | -.1294 | .1678 | .0287 | .1120 | .7117 | .3207 |
| | .038 | .021 | .003 | .611 | .045 | .000 | .000 |
| Profess. Org. | -.1172 | -.3015 | -.0711 | -.0247 | .1820 | .3448 | .6927 |
| | .036 | .000 | .205 | .661 | .001 | .000 | .000 |

Note. The upper number in each cell is the correlation coefficient. The lower number is the probability.

Table B

Correlation Coefficients for Paired Questions on Course Content

| Level of Influence | | Amount of Influence: Student | College Admin. | Govern-ment | Public | Employers | Licensing Agencies | Profess. Organiz. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | 4a | .6895 | .1672 | -.0544 | .2277 | .0906 | -.0176 | .0519 |
| | | .000 | .003 | .333 | .000 | .105 | .754 | .354 |
| College Admin. | 4b | .2148 | .6277 | .2072 | .1203 | .0426 | .0712 | -.0273 |
| | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .031 | .447 | .203 | .626 |
| Govt. | 4c | -.0195 | .1261 | .5529 | .1864 | .0532 | .1966 | .0317 |
| | | .730 | .024 | .000 | .001 | .343 | .000 | .573 |
| Public | 4d | .2022 | .0995 | .0979 | .5907 | .3291 | .0894 | .1233 |
| | | .000 | .076 | .082 | .000 | .000 | .111 | .028 |
| Employer | 4e | .1580 | .1321 | .0918 | .4604 | .7345 | .2973 | .2939 |
| | | .005 | .078 | .102 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| Licensing Agencies | 4f | -.0785 | -.0117 | .2158 | .1048 | .2273 | .7611 | .4228 |
| | | .163 | .835 | .000 | .061 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| Profess. Org. | 4g | -.0050 | -.0997 | .0422 | .1420 | .2467 | .4621 | .7121 |
| | | .930 | .075 | .453 | .011 | .000 | .000 | .000 |

Note. The upper number in each cell is the correlation coefficient. The lower number is the probability.

## Appendix C

Contingency Tables for Amount of Influence of Outside Groups on Courses Offered by Level of Influence

Table A

Faculty Perception of Amount of Student Influence on Courses Offered by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 23<br>46.0<br>71.9<br>7.2 | 14<br>28.0<br>18.7<br>4.4 | 12<br>24.0<br>7.6<br>3.7 | 1<br>2.0<br>2.4<br>0.3 | | 50<br>15.6 |
| Light | 8<br>8.2<br>25.0<br>2.5 | 45<br>45.9<br>60.0<br>14.0 | 43<br>43.9<br>27.2<br>13.4 | 1<br>1.0<br>2.4<br>0.3 | 1<br>1.0<br>6.7<br>0.3 | 98<br>30.5 |
| Moderate | 1<br>1.1<br>3.1<br>0.3 | 14<br>15.1<br>18.7<br>4.4 | 69<br>74.2<br>43.7<br>21.5 | 8<br>8.6<br>19.5<br>2.5 | 1<br>1.1<br>6.7<br>0.3 | 93<br>29.0 |
| Heavy | | 2<br>2.6<br>2.7<br>0.6 | 33<br>42.9<br>20.9<br>10.3 | 31<br>40.3<br>75.6<br>9.7 | 11<br>14.3<br>73.3<br>3.4 | 77<br>24.0 |
| Total | | | 1<br>33.3<br>0.6<br>0.3 | | 2<br>66.7<br>13.3<br>0.6 | 3<br>0.9 |
| Column Total | 32<br>10.0 | 75<br>23.4 | 158<br>49.2 | 41<br>12.8 | 15<br>4.7 | 321<br>100.0 |

Table B

Faculty Perception of Amount of College Administration Influence on Courses Offered by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 10<br>45.5<br>58.8<br>3.1 | 6<br>27.3<br>12.2<br>1.9 | 5<br>22.7<br>2.8<br>1.6 | 1<br>4.5<br>2.0<br>0.3 | | 22<br>6.9 |
| Light | 7<br>6.7<br>41.2<br>2.2 | 35<br>33.7<br>71.4<br>11.0 | 60<br>57.7<br>33.7<br>18.8 | 2<br>1.9<br>4.0<br>0.6 | | 104<br>32.6 |
| Moderate | | 6<br>5.8<br>12.2<br>1.9 | 84<br>80.8<br>47.2<br>26.3 | 11<br>10.6<br>22.0<br>3.4 | 3<br>2.9<br>12.0<br>0.9 | 104<br>32.6 |
| Heavy | | 2<br>2.5<br>4.1<br>0.6 | 29<br>36.7<br>16.3<br>9.1 | 33<br>41.8<br>66.0<br>10.3 | 15<br>19.0<br>60.0<br>4.7 | 79<br>24.8 |
| Total | | | | 3<br>30.0<br>6.0<br>0.9 | 7<br>70.0<br>28.0<br>2.2 | 10<br>3.1 |
| Column Total | 17<br>5.3 | 49<br>15.4 | 178<br>55.8 | 50<br>15.7 | 25<br>7.8 | 319<br>100.0 |

Table C

Faculty Perception of Amount of Government Influence on Courses Offered by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 35<br>40.2<br>81.4<br>11.1 | 11<br>12.6<br>17.5<br>3.5 | 40<br>46.0<br>27.4<br>12.7 | 1<br>1.1<br>2.2<br>0.3 | | 22<br>6.9 |
| Light | 8<br>8.6<br>18.6<br>2.5 | 43<br>46.2<br>68.3<br>13.7 | 40<br>43.0<br>27.4<br>12.7 | 2<br>2.2<br>4.4<br>0.6 | | 93<br>29.5 |
| Moderate | | 8<br>11.1<br>12.7<br>2.5 | 50<br>69.4<br>34.2<br>15.9 | 11<br>15.3<br>24.4<br>3.5 | 3<br>4.2<br>16.7<br>1.0 | 72<br>22.9 |
| Heavy | | 1<br>1.8<br>1.6<br>0.3 | 15<br>27.3<br>10.3<br>4.8 | 31<br>56.4<br>68.9<br>9.8 | 8<br>14.5<br>44.4<br>2.5 | 55<br>17.5 |
| Total | | | 1<br>12.5<br>0.7<br>0.3 | | 7<br>87.5<br>38.9<br>2.2 | 8<br>2.5 |
| Column Total | 43<br>13.7 | 63<br>20.0 | 146<br>46.3 | 45<br>14.3 | 18<br>5.7 | 315<br>100.0 |

Table D

Faculty Perception of Amount of Public Influence on Courses Offered by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 46<br>46.0<br>82.1<br>14.6 | 18<br>18.0<br>22.5<br>5.7 | 36<br>36.0<br>22.8<br>11.4 | | | 100<br>31.7 |
| Light | 8<br>7.1<br>14.3<br>2.5 | 49<br>43.4<br>61.3<br>15.6 | 56<br>49.6<br>35.4<br>17.8 | | | 113<br>35.9 |
| Moderate | 1<br>1.4<br>1.8<br>0.3 | 12<br>16.7<br>15.0<br>3.8 | 53<br>73.6<br>33.5<br>16.8 | 5<br>6.9<br>33.3<br>1.6 | 1<br>1.4<br>16.7<br>0.3 | 72<br>22.9 |
| Heavy | 1<br>3.6<br>1.8<br>0.3 | 1<br>3.6<br>1.3<br>0.3 | 13<br>46.4<br>8.2<br>4.1 | 10<br>35.7<br>66.7<br>3.2 | 3<br>10.7<br>50.0<br>1.0 | 28<br>8.9 |
| Total | | | | | 2<br>100.0<br>33.3<br>0.6 | 2<br>0.6 |
| Column Total | 56<br>17.8 | 80<br>25.4 | 158<br>50.2 | 15<br>4.8 | 6<br>1.9 | 315<br>100.0 |

Table E

Faculty Perception of Amount of Employer Influence on Courses Offered by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 22 | 11 | 11 | 1 | | 45 |
| | 48.9 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 2.2 | | 14.1 |
| | 71.0 | 16.2 | 7.4 | 1.8 | | |
| | 6.9 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 0.3 | | |
| Light | 7 | 35 | 35 | 1 | | 78 |
| | 9.0 | 44.9 | 44.9 | 1.3 | | 24.4 |
| | 22.6 | 51.5 | 23.5 | 1.8 | | |
| | 2.2 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 0.3 | | |
| Moderate | 2 | 20 | 73 | 10 | 3 | 108 |
| | 1.9 | 18.5 | 67.6 | 9.3 | 2.8 | 33.8 |
| | 6.5 | 29.4 | 49.0 | 18.2 | 17.6 | |
| | 0.6 | 6.3 | 22.8 | 3.1 | 0.9 | |
| Heavy | | 2 | 28 | 40 | 8 | 78 |
| | | 2.6 | 35.9 | 51.3 | 10.3 | 24.4 |
| | | 2.9 | 18.8 | 72.7 | 47.1 | |
| | | 0.6 | 8.8 | 12.5 | 2.5 | |
| Total | | | 2 | 3 | 6 | 11 |
| | | | 18.2 | 27.3 | 54.5 | 3.4 |
| | | | 1.3 | 5.5 | 35.3 | |
| | | | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.6 | |
| Column Total | 31 | 68 | 149 | 55 | 17 | 320 |
| | 9.7 | 21.3 | 46.6 | 17.2 | 5.3 | 100.0 |

Table F

Faculty Perception of Amount of Licensing Agencies Influence on Courses Offered by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 44<br>60.3<br>88.0<br>13.8 | 1<br>1.4<br>3.7<br>0.3 | 26<br>35.6<br>18.2<br>8.2 | 2<br>2.7<br>3.3<br>0.6 | | 73<br>22.9 |
| Light | 4<br>9.3<br>8.0<br>1.3 | 19<br>44.2<br>70.4<br>6.0 | 17<br>39.5<br>11.9<br>5.3 | | 3<br>7.0<br>7.7<br>0.9 | 43<br>13.5 |
| Moderate | 1<br>1.5<br>2.0<br>0.3 | 4<br>6.0<br>14.8<br>1.3 | 56<br>83.6<br>39.2<br>17.6 | 6<br>9.0<br>10.0<br>1.9 | | 67<br>21.0 |
| Heavy | 1<br>0.9<br>2.0<br>0.3 | 2<br>1.8<br>7.4<br>0.6 | 41<br>36.3<br>28.7<br>12.9 | 47<br>41.6<br>78.3<br>14.7 | 22<br>19.5<br>56.4<br>6.9 | 113<br>35.4 |
| Total | | 1<br>4.3<br>3.7<br>0.3 | 3<br>13.0<br>2.1<br>0.9 | 5<br>21.7<br>8.3<br>1.6 | 14<br>60.9<br>35.9<br>4.4 | 23<br>7.2 |
| Column Total | 50<br>15.7 | 27<br>8.5 | 143<br>44.8 | 60<br>18.8 | 39<br>12.2 | 319<br>100.0 |

Table G

Faculty Perception of Amount of Professional Organization Influence on Courses Offered by Level of Professional Organization Influence on Courses Offered.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 39<br>60.9<br>86.7<br>12.2 | 7<br>10.9<br>12.5<br>2.2 | 17<br>26.6<br>10.6<br>5.3 | 1<br>1.6<br>2.3<br>0.3 | | 64<br>20.0 |
| Light | 5<br>6.2<br>11.1<br>1.6 | 36<br>44.4<br>64.3<br>11.3 | 37<br>45.7<br>23.1<br>11.6 | 2<br>2.5<br>4.7<br>0.6 | 1<br>1.2<br>6.3<br>0.3 | 81<br>25.3 |
| Moderate | 1<br>1.1<br>2.2<br>0.3 | 12<br>13.0<br>21.4<br>3.8 | 67<br>72.8<br>41.9<br>20.9 | 11<br>12.0<br>25.6<br>3.4 | 1<br>1.1<br>6.3<br>0.3 | 92<br>28.8 |
| Heavy | | 1<br>1.3<br>1.8<br>0.3 | 37<br>48.7<br>23.1<br>11.6 | 29<br>38.2<br>67.4<br>9.1 | 9<br>11.8<br>56.3<br>2.8 | 76<br>23.8 |
| Total | | | 2<br>28.6<br>1.3<br>0.6 | | 5<br>71.4<br>31.3<br>1.6 | 7<br>2.2 |
| Column Total | 45<br>14.1 | 56<br>17.5 | 160<br>50.0 | 43<br>13.4 | 16<br>5.0 | 320<br>100.0 |

## Appendix D

Contingency Tables for Amount of Influence of Outside Groups on Course Content by Level of Influence

Table A

Faculty Perception of Amount of Student Influence on Course Content by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 23<br>67.7<br>69.7<br>7.2 | 4<br>11.8<br>5.5<br>1.3 | 7<br>20.6<br>3.9<br>2.2 | | | 34<br>10.7 |
| Light | 9<br>7.6<br>27.3<br>2.8 | 57<br>47.9<br>78.1<br>17.9 | 51<br>42.9<br>28.3<br>16.0 | 2<br>1.7<br>8.0<br>0.6 | | 119<br>37.4 |
| Moderate | 1<br>0.8<br>3.0<br>0.3 | 12<br>9.2<br>16.4<br>3.8 | 107<br>82.3<br>59.4<br>33.6 | 9<br>6.9<br>36.0<br>2.8 | 1<br>0.8<br>14.3<br>0.3 | 130<br>40.9 |
| Heavy | | | 15<br>48.4<br>8.3<br>4.7 | 12<br>38.7<br>48.0<br>3.8 | 4<br>12.9<br>57.1<br>1.3 | 31<br>9.7 |
| Total | | | | 2<br>50.0<br>8.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>50.0<br>28.6<br>.6 | 4<br>1.3 |
| Column Total | 33<br>10.4 | 73<br>23.0 | 180<br>56.6 | 25<br>7.9 | 7<br>2.2 | 318<br>100.0 |

Table B

Faculty Perception of Amount of College Administration Influence on Course Content by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 30<br>50.0<br>90.9<br>9.3 | 6<br>10.0<br>10.2<br>1.9 | 24<br>40.0<br>12.8<br>7.5 | | | 60<br>18.7 |
| Light | 2<br>1.4<br>6.1<br>0.6 | 45<br>30.6<br>76.3<br>14.0 | 96<br>65.3<br>51.3<br>29.9 | 3<br>2.0<br>9.1<br>0.9 | 1<br>0.7<br>11.1<br>0.3 | 147<br>45.8 |
| Moderate | | 8<br>10.1<br>13.6<br>2.5 | 62<br>78.5<br>33.2<br>19.3 | 8<br>10.1<br>24.2<br>2.5 | 1<br>1.3<br>11.1<br>0.3 | 79<br>24.6 |
| Heavy | | | 5<br>16.7<br>2.7<br>1.6 | 21<br>70.0<br>63.6<br>6.5 | 4<br>13.3<br>44.4<br>1.2 | 30<br>9.3 |
| Total | 1<br>20.0<br>3.0<br>0.3 | | | 1<br>20.0<br>3.0<br>0.3 | 3<br>60.0<br>33.3<br>0.9 | 5<br>1.6 |
| Column Total | 33<br>10.3 | 59<br>18.4 | 187<br>58.3 | 33<br>10.3 | 9<br>2.8 | 321<br>100.0 |

Table C

Faculty Perception of Amount of Government Influence on Course Content by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 46<br>46.9<br>83.6<br>14.5 | 8<br>8.2<br>14.5<br>2.5 | 43<br>43.9<br>24.7<br>13.5 | 1<br>1.0<br>3.7<br>0.3 | | 98<br>30.8 |
| Light | 7<br>5.7<br>12.7<br>2.2 | 40<br>32.8<br>72.7<br>12.6 | 70<br>57.4<br>40.2<br>22.0 | 5<br>4.1<br>18.5<br>1.6 | | 122<br>38.4 |
| Moderate | | 6<br>9.8<br>10.9<br>1.9 | 51<br>83.6<br>29.3<br>16.0 | 2<br>3.3<br>7.4<br>0.6 | 2<br>3.3<br>28.6<br>0.6 | 61<br>19.2 |
| Heavy | 2<br>5.4<br>3.6<br>0.6 | 1<br>2.7<br>1.8<br>0.3 | 10<br>27.0<br>5.7<br>3.1 | 19<br>51.4<br>70.4<br>6.0 | 5<br>13.5<br>71.4<br>1.6 | 37<br>11.6 |
| Total | | | | | | 0<br>0.0 |
| Column Total | 55<br>17.3 | 55<br>17.3 | 174<br>54.7 | 27<br>8.5 | 7<br>2.2 | 318<br>100.0 |

Table D

Faculty Perception of Amount of Public Influence on Course Content by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 58<br>53.2<br>92.1<br>18.2 | 7<br>6.4<br>9.6<br>2.2 | 44<br>40.4<br>26.8<br>13.8 | | | 109<br>34.2 |
| Light | 4<br>3.1<br>6.3<br>1.3 | 58<br>45.0<br>79.5<br>18.2 | 67<br>51.9<br>40.9<br>21.0 | | | 129<br>40.4 |
| Moderate | 1<br>1.6<br>1.6<br>0.3 | 8<br>12.7<br>11.0<br>2.5 | 49<br>77.8<br>29.9<br>15.4 | 3<br>4.8<br>21.4<br>0.9 | 2<br>3.2<br>40.0<br>0.6 | 63<br>19.7 |
| Heavy | | | 4<br>25.0<br>2.4<br>1.3 | 10<br>62.5<br>71.4<br>3.1 | 2<br>12.5<br>40.0<br>0.6 | 16<br>5.0 |
| Total | | | | 1<br>50.0<br>7.1<br>0.3 | 1<br>50.0<br>20.0<br>0.3 | 2<br>0.6 |
| Column Total | 63<br>19.7 | 73<br>22.9 | 164<br>51.4 | 14<br>4.4 | 5<br>1.6 | 319<br>100.0 |

Table E

Faculty Perception of Amount of Employer Influence on Course Content by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 25<br>50.0<br>80.6<br>7.8 | 8<br>16.0<br>13.8<br>2.5 | 17<br>34.0<br>9.9<br>5.3 | | | 50<br>15.6 |
| Light | 6<br>7.8<br>19.4<br>1.9 | 36<br>46.8<br>62.1<br>11.2 | 34<br>44.2<br>19.9<br>10.6 | 1<br>1.3<br>2.3<br>0.3 | | 77<br>24.0 |
| Moderate | | 10<br>9.2<br>17.2<br>3.1 | 95<br>87.2<br>55.6<br>29.6 | 4<br>3.7<br>9.1<br>1.2 | | 109<br>34.0 |
| Heavy | | 3<br>4.2<br>5.2<br>0.9 | 24<br>33.8<br>14.0<br>7.5 | 39<br>54.9<br>88.6<br>12.1 | 5<br>7.0<br>29.4<br>1.6 | 71<br>22.1 |
| Total | | 1<br>7.1<br>1.7<br>0.3 | 1<br>7.1<br>0.6<br>0.3 | | 12<br>85.7<br>70.6<br>3.7 | 14<br>4.4 |
| Column Total | 31<br>9.7 | 58<br>18.1 | 171<br>53.3 | 44<br>13.7 | 17<br>5.3 | 321<br>100.0 |

Table F

Faculty Perception of Amount of Licensing Agency Influence on Course Content by Level of Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 48<br>60.8<br>96.0<br>15.0 | 3<br>3.8<br>10.7<br>0.9 | 28<br>35.4<br>17.5<br>8.7 | | | 79<br>24.6 |
| Light | | 21<br>40.4<br>75.0<br>6.5 | 28<br>53.8<br>17.5<br>8.7 | 2<br>3.8<br>3.8<br>0.6 | 1<br>1.9<br>3.2<br>0.3 | 52<br>16.2 |
| Moderate | 2<br>2.9<br>4.0<br>0.6 | 2<br>2.9<br>7.1<br>0.6 | 63<br>91.3<br>39.4<br>19.6 | 2<br>2.9<br>3.8<br>0.6 | | 69<br>21.5 |
| Heavy | | 2<br>1.9<br>7.1<br>0.6 | 41<br>39.4<br>25.6<br>12.8 | 46<br>44.2<br>88.5<br>14.3 | 15<br>14.4<br>48.4<br>4.7 | 104<br>32.4 |
| Total | | | | 2<br>11.8<br>3.8<br>0.6 | 15<br>88.2<br>48.4<br>4.7 | 17<br>5.3 |
| Column Total | 50<br>15.6 | 28<br>8.7 | 160<br>49.8 | 52<br>16.2 | 31<br>9.7 | 321<br>100.0 |

Table G

Faculty Perception of Amount of Professional Organization Influence on Course Content by Level Influence.

| Amount / Count / Row % / Column % / Total % | Level: Very Low | Low | About Right | High | Very High | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 38<br>58.5<br>90.5<br>11.9 | 4<br>6.2<br>8.7<br>1.3 | 23<br>35.4<br>13.1<br>7.2 | | | 65<br>20.4 |
| Light | 3<br>4.3<br>7.1<br>0.9 | 33<br>47.8<br>71.7<br>10.3 | 32<br>46.4<br>18.3<br>10.0 | 1<br>1.4<br>2.2<br>0.3 | | 69<br>21.6 |
| Moderate | 1<br>1.0<br>2.4<br>0.3 | 7<br>6.9<br>15.2<br>2.2 | 84<br>82.4<br>48.0<br>26.3 | 10<br>9.8<br>21.7<br>3.1 | | 102<br>32.2 |
| Heavy | | 2<br>2.6<br>4.3<br>0.6 | 35<br>45.5<br>20.0<br>11.0 | 35<br>45.5<br>76.1<br>11.0 | 5<br>6.5<br>50.0<br>1.6 | 77<br>24.1 |
| Total | | | 1<br>16.7<br>0.6<br>0.3 | | 5<br>83.3<br>50.0<br>1.6 | 6<br>1.9 |
| Column Total | 42<br>13.2 | 46<br>14.4 | 175<br>54.9 | 46<br>14.4 | 10<br>3.1 | 319<br>100.0 |

# Appendix E

## Summary Tables for Percent Response for Influence of Outside Groups by Institutional Type

Table A

Percent Response for Influence on Courses Offered by Institutional Type.

| Group | Institutional type | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | TYCC | 18.0 | 29.9 | 26.8 | 24.2 | 1.0 |
| | MLAC | 11.8 | 31.5 | 32.3 | 23.6 | 0.8 |
| College administration | TYCC | 4.1 | 23.8 | 34.7 | 32.1 | 5.2 |
| | MLAC | 11.0 | 45.7 | 29.9 | 13.4 | 0.0 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | TYCC | 20.2 | 29.5 | 28.5 | 18.1 | 3.6 |
| | MLAC | 38.9 | 29.4 | 14.3 | 16.7 | 0.8 |
| Public | TYCC | 26.2 | 35.1 | 25.1 | 12.6 | 1.0 |
| | MLAC | 40.8 | 36.8 | 19.2 | 3.2 | 0.0 |
| Employers | TYCC | 12.4 | 21.6 | 31.4 | 30.9 | 3.6 |
| | MLAC | 16.5 | 28.3 | 37.8 | 14.2 | 3.1 |
| Licensing agencies | TYCC | 24.0 | 16.1 | 21.9 | 30.7 | 7.3 |
| | MLAC | 21.3 | 9.4 | 19.7 | 42.5 | 7.1 |
| Professional organizations | TYCC | 25.3 | 27.8 | 26.3 | 18.6 | 2.1 |
| | MLAC | 11.9 | 21.4 | 32.5 | 31.7 | 2.4 |

Note. TYCC is the abbreviation used for public, two-year, community college (n = 171). MLAC is the abbreviation for masters-degree, liberal arts and sciences college (n = 149). All figures are in percent.

Table B

Percent Response for Influence on Course Content by Institutional Type.

| Group | Institutional type | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | TYCC | 14.5 | 38.3 | 37.8 | 8.8 | 0.5 |
| | MLAC | 4.8 | 36.0 | 45.6 | 11.2 | 2.4 |
| College administration | TYCC | 12.4 | 44.3 | 28.9 | 11.9 | 2.6 |
| | MLAC | 28.3 | 48.0 | 18.1 | 5.5 | 0.0 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | TYCC | 23.4 | 40.1 | 24.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 |
| | MLAC | 42.5 | 35.4 | 11.8 | 10.2 | 0.0 |
| Public | TYCC | 32.5 | 37.1 | 22.7 | 7.2 | 0.5 |
| | MLAC | 37.0 | 45.7 | 15.0 | 1.6 | 0.8 |
| Employers | TYCC | 14.4 | 18.0 | 33.5 | 27.8 | 6.2 |
| | MLAC | 17.3 | 33.1 | 34.6 | 13.4 | 1.6 |
| Licensing agencies | TYCC | 24.7 | 17.5 | 22.2 | 29.4 | 6.2 |
| | MLAC | 24.4 | 14.2 | 20.5 | 37.0 | 3.9 |
| Professional organizations | TYCC | 24.4 | 23.8 | 26.9 | 22.3 | 2.6 |
| | MLAC | 14.2 | 18.1 | 40.2 | 26.8 | 0.8 |

Note. TYCC is the abbreviation used for public, two-year, community college (n = 171). MLAS is the abbreviation for masters-degree, liberal arts and sciences college (n = 149). All figures are in percent.

# Appendix F

## Summary Tables for Percent Response for Influence of Outside Groups by Faculty Characteristic

Table A

Percent Response Influence on Courses Offered by Academic Discipline or Field.

| Group | Discipline or Field | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | Lib. Arts | 8.1 | 26.2 | 31.5 | 32.9 | 1.3 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 21.6 | 34.5 | 26.9 | 16.4 | 0.6 |
| College administration | Lib. Arts | 3.4 | 32.4 | 33.8 | 27.0 | 3.4 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 9.9 | 32.2 | 32.2 | 22.8 | 2.9 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | Lib. Arts | 31.1 | 28.4 | 23.0 | 14.9 | 2.7 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 24.7 | 30.6 | 22.9 | 19.4 | 2.4 |
| Public | Lib. Arts | 30.8 | 39.7 | 21.9 | 6.8 | 0.7 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 32.5 | 32.5 | 23.7 | 10.7 | 0.6 |
| Employers | Lib. Arts | 17.4 | 26.8 | 38.3 | 14.8 | 2.7 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 10.5 | 22.2 | 30.4 | 32.7 | 4.1 |
| Licensing agencies | Lib. Arts | 30.4 | 15.5 | 24.3 | 25.0 | 4.7 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 15.9 | 11.8 | 18.2 | 44.7 | 9.4 |
| Professional organizations | Lib. Arts | 28.2 | 29.5 | 27.5 | 14.8 | 0.0 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 12.4 | 21.8 | 30.0 | 31.8 | 4.1 |

Note. All figures are in percent of each field.

Table B

Percent Response for Influence on Course Content by Academic Discipline or Field.

| Group | Discipline or Field | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | Lib. Arts | 11.6 | 32.2 | 40.4 | 14.4 | 1.4 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 9.9 | 41.5 | 41.5 | 5.8 | 1.2 |
| College administration | Lib. Arts | 20.1 | 40.3 | 24.8 | 12.1 | 2.7 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 17.0 | 50.9 | 24.6 | 7.0 | 0.6 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | Lib. Arts | 38.9 | 32.2 | 18.8 | 10.1 | 0.0 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 24.3 | 43.8 | 19.5 | 12.4 | 0.0 |
| Public | Lib. Arts | 39.6 | 36.9 | 20.8 | 2.7 | 0.0 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 29.2 | 43.9 | 18.7 | 7.0 | 1.2 |
| Employers | Lib. Arts | 23.5 | 28.2 | 33.6 | 12.8 | 2.0 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 8.2 | 20.5 | 34.5 | 30.4 | 6.4 |
| Licensing agencies | Lib. Arts | 32.9 | 19.5 | 24.2 | 21.5 | 2.0 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 17.0 | 13.5 | 19.3 | 42.1 | 8.2 |
| Professional organizations | Lib. Arts | 29.7 | 23.0 | 30.4 | 16.9 | 0.0 |
| | Prof./Tech. | 11.7 | 20.5 | 33.9 | 30.4 | 3.5 |

Note. All figures are in percent of each type.

Table C

Percent Response for Influence on Courses Offered by Academic Rank.

| Group | Rank | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | Instructor | 17.8 | 31.4 | 28.1 | 21.6 | 1.1 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 11.8 | 41.2 | 33.3 | 11.8 | 2.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 12.5 | 28.1 | 37.5 | 21.8 | 0.0 |
| | Professor | 11.4 | 22.9 | 22.9 | 42.9 | 0.0 |
| College administration | Instructor | 4.3 | 25.5 | 33.7 | 32.1 | 4.3 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 7.8 | 47.1 | 29.4 | 15.7 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 12.5 | 34.4 | 40.6 | 12.5 | 0.0 |
| | Professor | 17.1 | 51.4 | 22.9 | 8.6 | 0.0 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | Instructor | 21.7 | 29.9 | 28.3 | 16.8 | 3.3 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 34.0 | 28.0 | 16.0 | 22.0 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 28.1 | 46.9 | 9.4 | 15.6 | 0.0 |
| | Professor | 57.1 | 20.0 | 11.4 | 8.6 | 2.9 |
| Public | Instructor | 28.7 | 34.8 | 23.2 | 12.2 | 1.1 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 37.3 | 43.1 | 17.6 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 53.1 | 21.9 | 21.9 | 3.1 | 0.0 |
| | Professor | 35.3 | 41.2 | 17.6 | 5.9 | 0.0 |
| Employers | Instructor | 13.5 | 22.2 | 32.4 | 28.1 | 3.8 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 15.7 | 29.4 | 37.3 | 15.7 | 2.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 15.6 | 25.0 | 40.6 | 15.6 | 3.1 |
| | Professor | 20.0 | 25.7 | 37.1 | 14.3 | 2.9 |
| Licensing agencies | Instructor | 24.5 | 16.8 | 20.1 | 31.0 | 7.6 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 19.6 | 7.8 | 21.6 | 47.1 | 3.9 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 18.8 | 15.6 | 12.5 | 40.6 | 12.5 |
| | Professor | 31.4 | 5.7 | 22.9 | 31.4 | 8.6 |
| Professional organizations | Instructor | 25.9 | 25.9 | 26.5 | 19.5 | 2.2 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 11.8 | 15.7 | 29.4 | 41.2 | 2.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 15.6 | 31.3 | 28.1 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
| | Professor | 11.4 | 25.7 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 2.9 |

Note. All figures are in percent of each field.

Table D

Percent Response for Influence on Course Content by Academic Rank.

| Group | Rank | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | Instructor | 13.0 | 38.6 | 39.1 | 8.2 | 1.1 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 3.9 | 37.3 | 52.9 | 5.9 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 6.3 | 46.9 | 34.4 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| | Professor | 12.1 | 27.3 | 36.4 | 24.2 | 0.0 |
| College administration | Instructor | 13.0 | 45.9 | 25.9 | 12.4 | 2.7 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 15.7 | 62.7 | 15.7 | 5.9 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 31.3 | 37.5 | 25.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
| | Professor | 45.7 | 34.3 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | Instructor | 24.6 | 41.0 | 20.8 | 13.7 | 0.0 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 35.3 | 41.2 | 17.6 | 5.9 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 37.5 | 37.5 | 15.6 | 9.4 | 0.0 |
| | Professor | 62.9 | 22.9 | 5.7 | 8.6 | 0.0 |
| Public | Instructor | 33.5 | 38.4 | 20.5 | 7.0 | 0.5 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 33.3 | 47.1 | 17.6 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 43.8 | 40.6 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Professor | 42.9 | 37.1 | 14.3 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Employers | Instructor | 15.1 | 17.8 | 34.1 | 27.0 | 5.9 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 15.7 | 37.3 | 33.3 | 13.7 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 21.9 | 25.0 | 40.6 | 9.4 | 3.1 |
| | Professor | 20.0 | 25.7 | 34.3 | 17.1 | 2.9 |
| Licensing agencies | Instructor | 26.5 | 15.1 | 20.0 | 12.4 | 5.9 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 15.7 | 15.7 | 23.5 | 45.1 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 21.9 | 18.8 | 21.9 | 31.3 | 6.3 |
| | Professor | 42.9 | 17.1 | 14.3 | 17.1 | 8.6 |
| Professional organizations | Instructor | 25.0 | 22.8 | 28.3 | 21.7 | 2.2 |
| | Assist. Prof. | 9.8 | 19.6 | 39.2 | 31.4 | 0.0 |
| | Assoc. Prof. | 21.9 | 18.8 | 28.1 | 31.3 | 0.0 |
| | Professor | 17.1 | 20.0 | 42.9 | 17.1 | 2.9 |

Note. All figures are in percent of each rank.

Table E

Percent Response for Influence on Courses Offered by Tenure.

| Group | Tenure Status | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | Tenured | 12.8 | 32.0 | 30.4 | 24.8 | 0.0 |
| | Non-Tenured | 17.5 | 29.9 | 27.8 | 23.2 | 1.5 |
| College administration | Tenured | 9.7 | 39.5 | 32.3 | 17.7 | 0.8 |
| | Non-Tenured | 5.2 | 27.8 | 33.5 | 29.4 | 4.1 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | Tenured | 38.4 | 32.0 | 16.8 | 12.0 | 0.8 |
| | Non-Tenured | 20.8 | 28.1 | 27.1 | 20.3 | 3.6 |
| Public | Tenured | 36.1 | 32.8 | 25.4 | 5.7 | 0.0 |
| | Non-Tenured | 29.2 | 38.0 | 20.8 | 10.9 | 1.0 |
| Employers | Tenured | 16.8 | 20.8 | 39.2 | 20.0 | 3.2 |
| | Non-Tenured | 12.4 | 26.8 | 30.4 | 26.8 | 3.6 |
| Licensing agencies | Tenured | 28.2 | 12.1 | 17.7 | 37.9 | 4.0 |
| | Non-Tenured | 19.7 | 14.5 | 22.8 | 33.7 | 9.3 |
| Professional organizations | Tenured | 15.2 | 25.6 | 33.6 | 24.8 | 0.8 |
| | Non-Tenured | 23.3 | 25.4 | 25.4 | 22.8 | 3.1 |

Note. All figures are in percent of each tenure status.

Table F

Percent Response for Influence on Course Content by Tenure.

| Group | Tenure Status | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | Tenured | 7.3 | 30.1 | 52.0 | 9.8 | 0.8 |
| | Non-Tenured | 13.0 | 42.5 | 33.7 | 9.3 | 1.6 |
| College administration | Tenured | 25.6 | 45.6 | 21.6 | 7.2 | 0.0 |
| | Non-Tenured | 14.4 | 45.9 | 26.8 | 10.8 | 2.1 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | Tenured | 42.4 | 34.4 | 12.8 | 10.4 | 0.0 |
| | Non-Tenured | 24.0 | 40.6 | 23.4 | 12.0 | 0.0 |
| Public | Tenured | 37.6 | 35.2 | 24.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 |
| | Non-Tenured | 32.0 | 44.3 | 16.5 | 6.2 | 1.0 |
| Employers | Tenured | 17.6 | 19.2 | 36.0 | 24.8 | 2.4 |
| | Non-Tenured | 14.4 | 27.3 | 32.0 | 20.6 | 5.7 |
| Licensing agencies | Tenured | 30.4 | 13.6 | 17.6 | 32.8 | 5.6 |
| | Non-Tenured | 21.1 | 18.0 | 23.7 | 32.0 | 5.2 |
| Professional organizations | Tenured | 20.0 | 15.2 | 38.4 | 24.0 | 2.4 |
| | Non-Tenured | 20.7 | 25.9 | 28.0 | 23.8 | 1.6 |

Note. All figures are in percent of each tenure status.

Table G

Percent Response for Influence on Courses Offered by Race.

| Group | Race | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | Wnon-Hisp. | 16.0 | 32.7 | 28.2 | 22.8 | 0.3 |
| | Minority | 11.5 | 7.7 | 34.6 | 38.5 | 7.7 |
| College administration | Wnon-Hisp. | 7.5 | 34.1 | 32.1 | 24.2 | 2.0 |
| | Minority | 0.0 | 15.4 | 38.5 | 30.8 | 15.4 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | Wnon-Hisp. | 28.1 | 30.1 | 23.6 | 16.1 | 2.1 |
| | Minority | 19.2 | 23.1 | 15.4 | 34.6 | 7.7 |
| Public | Wnon-Hisp. | 33.4 | 35.9 | 21.7 | 8.6 | 0.3 |
| | Minority | 12.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 12.0 | 4.0 |
| Employers | Wnon-Hisp. | 14.3 | 24.5 | 35.7 | 23.8 | 3.7 |
| | Minority | 7.7 | 23.1 | 38.5 | 30.8 | 0.0 |
| Licensing agencies | Wnon-Hisp. | 22.9 | 13.4 | 20.9 | 35.6 | 7.2 |
| | Minority | 23.1 | 15.4 | 23.1 | 30.8 | 7.7 |
| Professional organizations | Wnon-Hisp. | 20.4 | 24.8 | 27.6 | 24.8 | 2.4 |
| | Minority | 16.0 | 32.0 | 44.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 |

Note. White, non-Hispanic is abbreviated Wnon-Hisp.
All figures are in percent of each race.

Table H

Percent Response for Influence on Course Content by Race.

| Group | Race | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | White | 11.0 | 38.5 | 40.5 | 8.6 | 1.4 |
| | Non-White | 7.7 | 26.9 | 42.3 | 23.1 | 0.0 |
| College administration | White | 19.7 | 47.3 | 23.8 | 8.2 | 1.0 |
| | Non-White | 7.7 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 23.1 | 7.7 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | White | 32.8 | 36.9 | 19.5 | 10.9 | 0.0 |
| | Non-White | 12.0 | 52.0 | 16.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
| Public | White | 35.7 | 40.5 | 18.4 | 4.8 | 0.7 |
| | Non-White | 19.2 | 38.5 | 34.6 | 7.7 | 0.0 |
| Employers | White | 16.0 | 22.4 | 34.4 | 22.8 | 4.4 |
| | Non-White | 11.5 | 38.5 | 30.8 | 15.4 | 3.8 |
| Licensing agencies | White | 25.2 | 15.0 | 21.8 | 32.7 | 5.4 |
| | Non-White | 19.2 | 30.8 | 19.2 | 26.9 | 3.8 |
| Professional organizations | White | 21.5 | 20.1 | 31.7 | 24.6 | 2.0 |
| | Non-White | 3.1 | 38.5 | 38.5 | 15.4 | 0.0 |

Note. All figures are in percent of each race.

Table I

Summary of Percent Response for Influence on Courses Offered by Gender.

| Group | Gender | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | Female | 17.3 | 31.4 | 29.8 | 20.9 | 0.5 |
| | Male | 12.7 | 29.4 | 27.8 | 28.6 | 1.6 |
| College administration | Female | 7.4 | 31.1 | 32.6 | 25.8 | 3.2 |
| | Male | 6.3 | 34.1 | 32.5 | 23.8 | 3.2 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | Female | 22.8 | 28.6 | 24.9 | 20.6 | 3.2 |
| | Male | 34.1 | 31.7 | 19.8 | 12.7 | 1.6 |
| Public | Female | 33.2 | 34.2 | 25.1 | 7.0 | 0.5 |
| | Male | 31.0 | 38.9 | 19.0 | 10.3 | 0.8 |
| Employers | Female | 15.2 | 22.5 | 36.6 | 22.5 | 3.1 |
| | Male | 11.9 | 26.2 | 31.0 | 27.0 | 4.0 |
| Licensing agencies | Female | 17.5 | 11.1 | 19.6 | 41.8 | 10.1 |
| | Male | 12.1 | 17.5 | 23.0 | 27.0 | 2.4 |
| Professional organizations | Female | 21.5 | 23.0 | 23.6 | 28.8 | 3.1 |
| | Male | 15.2 | 29.6 | 37.6 | 16.8 | 0.8 |

Note. All figures are in percent of each gender.

Table J

Summary of Percent Response for Influence on Course Content by Gender.

| Group | Gender | None | Light | Moderate | Heavy | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | Female | 12.1 | 36.8 | 40.5 | 8.9 | 1.6 |
| | Male | 7.3 | 38.7 | 42.7 | 10.5 | 0.8 |
| College administration | Female | 17.8 | 47.1 | 25.1 | 8.9 | 1.0 |
| | Male | 19.0 | 44.4 | 23.8 | 10.3 | 2.4 |
| Local, state, or federal govt. | Female | 25.1 | 41.4 | 21.5 | 12.0 | 0.0 |
| | Male | 38.7 | 33.9 | 16.1 | 11.3 | 0.0 |
| Public | Female | 33.0 | 44.0 | 18.8 | 3.1 | 1.0 |
| | Male | 35.7 | 35.7 | 21.4 | 7.1 | 0.0 |
| Employers | Female | 13.1 | 25.7 | 38.2 | 19.9 | 3.1 |
| | Male | 18.3 | 21.4 | 28.6 | 25.4 | 6.3 |
| Licensing agencies | Female | 18.3 | 14.1 | 25.7 | 34.6 | 7.3 |
| | Male | 33.3 | 19.8 | 15.1 | 29.4 | 2.4 |
| Professional organizations | Female | 19.9 | 20.9 | 30.4 | 26.2 | 2.6 |
| | Male | 19.0 | 23.0 | 35.7 | 21.4 | 0.8 |

Note. All figures are in percent of each gender.